THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, B.D.

Vol. VIII. JANUARY, 1924 No. 43.

Property of CBDP
Please return to
Graduate Theological Union Library

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

Some Recent Discoveries in Babylonian Literature (I.) - - - - G. R. Driver.
St. Paul's Apostolic Commission - - F. J. Badcock.
The Atonement: II. Christ's Death a Satisfaction for Sin - - - - E. G. Selwyn.
Training and True Priest-Craft - - Bishop of St. Alban's.

MISCELLANEA

In the Study: Recent French Theology - The Abbot of Pershore and Dr. Sparrow-Simpson.
The Western Text of the Acts - - - W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D.

REVIEW

Religion since the Reformation (Dr. Leighton Pullan) - - - - Dean of Winchester.

NOTICES AND BOOK NOTES

CORRESPONDENCE

LONDON — Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LTD.

. per copy: 12s. a year post free. U.S.A. and Canada, 30c. $3.60 a year post free

V 39
1924

THEOLOGY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, M.A.

MONTHLY, 1s. *SUBSCRIPTION*, 12s. *per annum.* HALF-YEARLY VOLUMES: Vols. I.–VI., each 10s.; Vol. VII., July to December, 1923, 10s.

Cases may be had from S.P.C.K. at 1s. 6d. each. Back numbers can be obtained at 1s. each, postage extra.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS:

1923.

May.	Old Testament Criticism: Some Misgivings	W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D.
	What is the Gospel?	W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D.
	Troeltsch and his Contribution to Religious Thought	A. C. Bouquet, D.D.
June.	Christianity and the Public Schools	Canon Lyttelton, D.D.
	Parochial Retreats	J. F. L. Southam.
	The Supernatural Basis of Christian Character	E. G. Selwyn.
	A Bishop of the Fourteenth Century	J. Kestell Floyer, D.D.
July.	Dante and Justinian	Dean of Winchester.
	Thirty-three Years at St. Paul's	Canon Newbolt.
	Religion in Art	Mrs. Hansen Bay.
	Ecclesiastical Courts (I.)	Canon Lacey.
	From St. Matthew to St. Luke	Vivian MacMunn.
August.	The Christology of Professor Mackintosh	Charles Harris, D.D.
	The Management of Glebe	H. R. M. Hutt.
	Ecclesiastical Courts (II.)	Canon Lacey.
	A Glimpse given in the Earliest Gospel	E. P. Boys-Smith.
	Religion and Poetry	D. C. Carew.
September.	"God: God and Man"	P. N. Waggett, D.D.
	Belief in a Personal Devil	F. H. Brabant.
	Adversaria Exegetica (Mark xiv. 28)	E. C. Hoskyns.
	The Condition and Needs of England	H. H. Kelly, S.S.M.
	Religion and Marriage	Mary Scharlieb, M.D.
October.	Questions on the Eucharistic Presence	C. J. Shebbeare.
	The Eucharistic Sacrifice	Will Spens.
	The Atonement: I. The Content of Salvation	E. G. Selwyn.
November.	Bishop Talbot's Farewell to his Clergy.	
	The Synoptic Problem from a Missionary's Point of View	Bishop of Zanzibar.
	Concerning the Grey Book	J. K. Mozley, B.D.
December.	Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?	F. R. M. Hitchcock, D.D.
	The "Dual System" and the Problem of Education	Geraldine E. Hodgson, Litt.D.
	Grouping of Church and Council Schools	H. H. Arkell.

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII JANUARY, 1924 No. 43

EDITORIAL

One of the most striking facts of the situation at home on which the New Year opens is that the prospect of the reins of government passing to the Labour Party is regarded without any dismay by those who have the work of the Church most at heart. Such an outlook would be almost impossible on the Continent to-day, and would have been impossible in this country a generation ago. The truth is that the labours of the Christian Socialists, and still more of great teachers like Scott Holland, have borne fruit. As Lady Astor has said, in a telling letter to *The Times* (December 12, 1923), "The moral, spiritual, and domestic forces of this country are becoming more powerful every day. Any party which ignores or offends them must suffer. . . ." The Church's task, as we conceive it, is not to identify itself with any party, but to provide the atmosphere in which the government of the country may be carried on to best advantage. The great security at the moment is that in each party there are many members who value this atmosphere and believe in the Christian principles which it expresses.

We have received a copy of a remarkable contribution to the literature of Reunion in the shape of a complete translation of the Book of Common Prayer into Greek.* We understand that the translation is the work of Dr. Brightman. The Greek is best described, perhaps, as on the New Testament model, with such borrowings from modern Greek as are necessary. With the exception of the printer's name, there is not a syllable of English from cover to cover: even S.P.C.K. is turned into Greek. In a short Foreword the Archbishop of Canterbury dwells on the opportuneness of this edition at a moment "when the Churches of the East and of the West are in earnest about one another" (*σπουδάζουσιν ἀλλήλας*). A book of this kind probably does as much for Reunion as many a treatise; though it may be long before its effects are visible. Meanwhile, the curious in our own country will turn to the book to discover how many an old-fashioned rubric or title may be turned into Greek.

* S.P.C.K. 1923.

337940

SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

I.—THE EPIC OF CREATION

As long ago as 1875, Dr. G. Smith was the first to recognize and to publish fragments of a Babylonian poem, which embodied the beliefs of the Babylonians about the origin of the universe, and in which many passages bore a striking resemblance to the cosmogony of the Book of Genesis. These fragments came from Ashurbânipal's library at Nineveh, and were therefore Assyrian copies of originals made in the south, in Babylonia. An interesting light is now thrown on this fact by the discovery that, where the original Babylonian narrative had Marduk (the Merodach of the Old Testament), the supreme god of Babylon, the Assyrian scribes had substituted for him Anshar, a form of the name of their own god, Ashur. After the publication of Dr. Smith's texts, new tablets or fragments of tablets of the same poem were acquired from time to time by the British Museum; and these texts were eventually gathered together and edited by the late Mr. King in 1902, under the title of *The Seven Tablets of Creation*. This work, which has remained for twenty years the *editio princeps*, contained large portions of Tablets I.-IV., fragments of Tablet V., a few lines of Tablet VI., and about a half of Tablet VII. Unfortunately, what is to us perhaps the most interesting part of the poem—namely, the creation of man in Tablet VI.—was very imperfectly preserved.

Our knowledge of the Epic of Creation has, however, now been very materially increased by the discoveries made in the course of the German excavations at Ashshur, excavations which were cut short by the outbreak of the European War. But since the Armistice German scholars have set to work to publish the results of their labours in Assyria and several volumes of cuneiform texts have appeared, amongst which Dr. Ebeling has included a large number of religious pieces. These contain very important fragments of the Epic of Creation, notably large portions of Tablet I., which fill up the largest gap in it, and the whole of Tablet VI. Dr. Ebeling has not only given very careful copies of the originals, but has also edited the complete poem in transcription and translation under the title of *Das babylonische Weltschöpfungslied*, or "The Babylonian Poem of Creation." The difficulties under which German scholars labour can be gauged from the fact that Dr. Ebeling

was unable to have his work printed, and was therefore compelled to have his own manuscript autographed. An English edition by Professor Langdon is now in the press, and is expected to appear shortly.

The date of the composition of the Epic is uncertain. The tablets found by the Germans at Ashshur can be referred approximately to a date between the twelfth and the tenth century B.C.; but they were copied from originals stored in the temple archives at Nippur and Babylon. These are the earliest known fragments. Mr. King knew of none which could be dated earlier than the seventh century B.C., since most of his texts came from the library of Ashurbânipal (669-626 B.C.). Later fragments have also been found, as well as "practice-tablets"—that is, tablets made by scribes who were learning to write by copying older texts—which can hardly be assigned to any definite period. To fix even an approximate date for its composition it is consequently necessary to fall back upon external evidence, both artistic and historical; internal evidence, when the text is conflate and based on numerous fragments copied at very various times, and coloured by the style and theological prejudices of the period and school to which the copyist belonged, is obviously of very little value. Thus there is a representation of the conflict between Marduk and Tiâmat sculptured upon two slabs of limestone set up in the temple of Ninurta, built by Ashurnâsirpal III. (884-860 B.C.). This evidence, though later than the date ascribed to the new texts published by Dr. Ebeling, is of interest, like the frequent occurrence of the same scene upon seals of the late Assyrian and Persian period, as attesting the wide influence of the story of the creation upon Assyro-Babylonian art. But a knowledge of this legend can be proved already in the seventeenth century B.C. For in a long inscription, of which a copy has been found at Nineveh, Agum-Kakrime, the seventh king of the Cassite dynasty (*c.* 2068-1710 B.C.), tells of his restoration to their own sanctuaries of the statues of Marduk and of Zarpanitum, his consort, which had been carried captive into a distant land, and describes the works of art with which he adorned these statues and their shrines. In them the influence of the Epic is clearly seen, especially upon the panels of the doors; for there he had the monsters whom Marduk subdued in his combat with Tiâmat depicted, and the list is almost identical with that given in the Epic. But whether this proves, as Professor Langdon says, that "the Epic was undoubtedly written in the period of the first Babylonian dynasty" (*c.* 2225-1925 B.C.) is not so certain; it need only prove that the story was current then in substantially the same form as

that in which it was written down, sometime before the twelfth or tenth century.

In form the poem is epic; it consists partly of narrative and partly of the conversations of the protagonists on both sides, interspersed with sketches of the assembly of the gods and battle-scenes, exactly as does the *Iliad*, of the unformed world and of the creation of mankind. Like the *Iliad*, too, it is full of repetition. But it has none of the life and fire of that great work; it is stiff and heavy, like some archaic statue from Babylon, and the style is bald and devoid of all literary grace. The lines fall into two halves, which in turn also often show a minor cæsura, corresponding to the main cæsura of the whole line; and often a clearly defined parallelism, like that of the Hebrew poets, balances the two halves of the line and not infrequently the two lines of the couplet, into which the metre tends naturally to fall. A simple form of parallelism within a single line, with a well-defined cæsura, occurs in I. 38:

> By day I rest not, by night I sleep not.

An example of the same phenomenon running through the couplet is afforded by I. 81-82:

> In the midst of the deep was Ashur created,
> In the midst of the pure deep was Ashur created,

where the second line adds a little to the description contained in the preceding line. Further, the arrangement of the strophes is often chiastic, as in I. 83-84:

> There begat him Lakhmu, his father,
> Lakhamu, his mother, gave him birth.

This parallelism is sometimes, but far more rarely, replaced, as in Hebrew poetry, by an antithetic balance, as in IV. 109-110:

> They sought to extricate themselves, to save their lives;
> They were encircled with restraint that escape was not possible.

But neither parallelism nor antithetic balance are regularly observed in the Epic of Creation, any more than they are in Hebrew poetry.

Tablet I. opens with a scene of chaos and rebellion. The universe is depicted, as in Gen. i. 2, as "waste and void," and nothing was as yet named:

> When on high the heavens were not named
> And the earth beneath was not called by name,
> (When) Mummu and Tiâmat that bare them all
> Mingled their waters together
> And the reed-land was not formed nor the marshes seen.
>
> (I. 1-6)

namely, " when no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up," then were the gods created. The creation of light is not mentioned, but is presupposed by the story; consequently, as in Gen. i. 3-4, the light was the first thing created, so in the Babylonian account light preceded everything else. Mummu, the minister of Apsû, " the great deep," is the λόγος of Babylonian philosophy, and here corresponds to " the spirit of God brooding upon the face of the waters " (Gen. i. 2); Tiâmat is the same word as the Hebrew *Tĕhôm*, which is rendered " the Deep " in the English versions. From the union of Apsû, " the deep sea," and Tiâmat, the monster of the deep, there came into being the pair of gods Lakhmu and Lakhamu, his consort, and many generations later were born Anshar and Kishar:

Then were the gods created in their midst,
Lakhmu and Lakhamu were brought into being (and) called by name;
The ages increased (and) they grew up;
Anshar and Kishar were created, they were greater than they.
(I. 9-12)

These two, Anshar and Kishar, were the first gods of order, and they begat Anu, the god of heaven, and Ea, the god of water, who are reflected in " the firmament " and " the waters " respectively of the Hebrew legend. Then they came together and planned rebellion against Tiâmat, Apsû, and Mummu, the forces of disorder. Thereupon Tiâmat, Apsû, and Mummu, his minister, take counsel; Apsû and Mummu wish to destroy the rebellious gods, while Tiâmat is bitterly grieved at his plan, being unwilling that they should destroy what they have themselves created, saying:

" How shall we ourselves destroy what we have made ?" (I. 45)

recalling the words of Yahweh: " And every living thing that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the ground " (Gen. vii. 4). But Apsû and Mummu, having gained their point, proceed against Ea, who utterly defeats his two adversaries by means of a " pure incantation ":

He devised for himself a curse over all things and made it,
He made a pure incantation, exceedingly cunning;
He recited it, he caused it to be on the waters,
He poured out sleep upon him as he slumbered in the cavern (?),
(I. 61-64)

when he fell upon him and Mummu by his side, and

Then he bound Apsû and slew him. (I. 69)

and

He fixed upon Apsû his dwelling. (I. 71)

This story of a " deep sleep " reappears in another guise in Hebrew legend, where " the Lord God caused a deep sleep

to fall upon the man, and he slept" (Gen. ii. 21), and out of the sleep performed an act of creation, just as Ea, out of the sleep of Apsû, created his dwelling-place. And, curiously enough, just as

> Therein he caused to be founded his dark abode,
> (And) Ea and Lakhamu, his spouse, dwelled (there) in state,
> (I. 77-78)

that is, as Ea left the gods, his parents, and dwelled with Lakhamu, so "shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife" (Gen. ii. 24). Thereupon Marduk, the champion of the gods, is born to Ea and Lakhamu. When the death of Apsû and Mummu are announced to Tiâmat, she creates nine monsters to fight for her; and the rest of Tablet I. is occupied with the description of them and the exaltation of Kingu to be her second husband:

> Among the gods her first-born who formed [her assembly]
> She exalted Kingu; in their midst she magnified him
> (I. 146-147)

and

> She gave him the tablets of fate, she made (him) clasp (them) to his breast (I. 156)

like the Urim and Thummim which were put in "the breast-plate of judgement," and were worn "upon Aaron's heart" (Exod. xxviii. 29-30).

Tablets II. and III. record the preparations for battle and the preliminary skirmishes of Ea and Tiâmat, in which the former is discomfited and flees. Likewise, Anu is defeated by Tiâmat, and Anshar and the gods are in despair, when Marduk offers himself as their champion. In the question which he puts to his father Anshar:

> What *man* is it that has brought his battle-array against thee?
> (II. 110)

and in Anshar's answer:

> [My son] it is Tiâmat who is a *woman;* she marches against thee with weapons (II. 111)

there is perhaps a forecast of the story of Fall of Man, in which a woman caused the downfall of a man, just as Tiâmat brought about the ruin of her brood. Marduk then demands promotion to the rank of a great god if he is victorious, and this is granted in a full assembly of the gods:

> From henceforth is thy word unalterable
> To exalt and to abase—that is thy power.
> (IV. 7-8)

At the same time that he is made their avenger, he receives authority to declare the fates and to work miracles. This power is tested by the miracle of the garment:

Then they set in their midst a garment,
Saying unto Marduk their first-born:
"Verily thy destiny, O Lord, is equal unto (that of) the gods;
To destroy and to create—command (and) they will be done.
Open thy mouth; the garment will be destroyed;
Command it again, and the garment will be made whole."
He commanded and at his word the garment was destroyed;
Again he commanded it, and the garment was created (anew).
(IV. 19-26)

No reader can fail to compare the fleece of wool whereby Gideon tested the word of the Lord (Judg. vi. 36-40). Marduk, then, having proved his power, is invested by the gods with the emblems and weapons of a warrior god:

They bestowed upon him the sceptre, the throne, and the axe,
They gave unto him weapons irresistible to repel the foe
(IV. 29-30)

among which were the bow and arrow, the toothed sickle, and the net together with the lightning before him and a burning flame within. The Hebrew psalmists clothed the Lord in a similar panoply—*e.g.*, "He sent out his arrows, and scattered them; and He shot out lightnings, and discomfited them" (Psalm xviii. 14); and again: "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his adversaries round about. His lightnings lightened the world: the earth saw, and trembled" (Psalm xcvii. 3-4). At the same time Marduk created and took command of the winds and the cyclone, and

He drove the chariot of the storm, the irresistible, the terrible
(IV. 50)

as Yahweh "rode upon a cherub, and did fly: yea, he flew swiftly upon the wings of the wind" (Psalm xviii. 10). So Marduk went forth to do battle, and utterly defeated Tiâmat and all her host:

He bound them and brake their weapons,
They were cast into the net and sat in the toils
(IV. 111-112)

a phrase reminiscent of the verse: "The cords of Sheol were round about me: the snares of death came upon me" (Psalm xviii. 5).

Her supporters being all either bound or slain, and Kingu, her husband, also bound, Marduk returned to despatch Tiâmat:

He severed the veins of her blood,
The north wind carried it away unto hidden places.
(IV. 131-132)

Tiâmat's blood is carried off to the distant south, whence Dr. Jensen has suggested that the Persian Gulf was called by the ancients the "Red Sea," because it was dyed red, according to the legend, with the blood of Tiâmat.

With the body of Tiâmat Marduk created the world:
When he had cut her into two parts like an oyster (?),
He set up the half of her and made the heavens a canopy;
He shot the bolt and posted a watch
Charging them not to let the waters thereof come forth.
He scanned the heavens, he strode the regions (thereof),
And over against (them) he poised Apsû, the abode of Ea.
When the lord had measured the form of Apsû,
He stablished as its counterpart Esharra, the great abode.
(IV. 137-144)

Thus was created the canopy of heaven, formed of one-half of Tiâmat's body, and over against it Apsû, the watery deep, and between them the earth, called Esharra, the "great abode," wherein the trinity of the great gods, Anu, Enlil, and Ea, were appointed to dwell.

Tablet V. constitutes an interlude, being an astronomical poem on the movements of the planets, the motions of the moon and the positions of the signs of the zodiac in the newly created heavens; so, too, in the Hebrew cosmogony, the creation of the lights in the firmament (Gen. i. 14-19) followed the creation of light (which is presupposed in the Babylonian account) and of the firmament, the gathering together of the waters into one place and the appearance of dry land. Of this poem only twenty-five lines have been preserved, and the creation of the sun is missing; but the fixing of the stars is mentioned, and

He caused the new moon to shine forth (and) entrusted the night (unto him);
He assigned unto him the fixing of the night, to assign (the passing of) the days. (V. 12-13)

so that the moon plays a greater part than in the Old Testament, where it is named "the lesser light to rule the night" (Gen. i. 16).

Of Tablet VI., which records the creation of man, almost the whole has now been recovered by the German excavators. This event occupies the twenty-eight opening lines of the tablet:

When Marduk heard the words of the gods,
His heart prompted him to create things cunningly devised;
He opened his mouth to [tell] unto Ea
[What] he had conceived in his heart and he gave counsel:
"Blood will I construct, and bone will I cause to be,
And I will cause Lilû to stand forth; surely Man is his name."
(VI. 1-6)

The Babylonian word *iṣṣimtu*, "bone," which is here used, is identical with the Hebrew word *eṣem*, which is employed in the verse: "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (Gen. ii. 23). Marduk then continues to expound his plan:

"I will indeed create Lilû, (even) Man;
Let the service of the gods be imposed (upon him), let them, (even) them, be appeased," (VI. 5-6)

showing that his motive for the creation was the worship of the gods, and the maintenance of their services, and the offering of sacrifices to appease them. Ea, however, saw difficulties in the way of this creation of man *ex nihilo*, and suggested a further device:

Then Ea answered him, speaking a word unto him,
For the appeasing of the gods he recounted unto him a plan:
"Then let there be given one (who is) their brother,
Let that one perish that men may be fashioned."
(VI. 11-14)

Thus man is to be created of one of the gods, as the woman was created of the rib of the man (Gen. ii. 21-22), but only through the death of that man, to ensure the well-being of his brothers, which depended on the maintenance of regular services and offerings. Marduk then, at the bidding of Ea, summoned the gods to an assembly in order to announce to them his intention, and to choose a victim:

"Surely the former things (which) we have proclaimed (?) unto you are (become) true,
The truth have I sworn, (even) an oath by myself,"
(VI. 21-22)

referring to the oath which he had sworn before the assembly that he would bind Tiâmat if he were given authority to determine the fates,

"Whosoever it was that created rebellion
(And) caused Tiâmat to revolt and joined battle,
Shall be given, and him that created the war
I will cause to bear his transgression; sit ye in peace."
(VI. 23-26)

And the great gods answered him, saying:
" Kingu it was who created rebellion
(And) caused Tiâmat to revolt and joined battle."
(VI. 29-30)

The narrative then recounts the actual creation of man by Ea, in the following words:

They bound him and brought him before Ea;
They laid upon him the penalty and cut off his blood.
Of his blood he created (?) mankind
For the service of the gods, and set the gods free.
(VI. 31-34)

The text in line 33 is open to some doubt, but " created " seems the most probable reading. Another possibility is " mixed," in which case man must have been created by mixing the blood of Kingu with clay; this accords with a Sumerian version of the event, derived from Nippur, in which the mother-goddess was supposed to have created man from clay alone, while another Semitic legend states that Ea ordered a god to be slain, and then ordained the creation of man from a mixture of this blood and of clay. The narrative then concludes the account of the creation with the verses:

After Ea had created mankind and (?)
Had imposed upon him the service of the gods,
That work was past understanding. (VI. 35-27)

precisely as the Hebrew narrator closes his account of the creation with the words: " And, behold, it was very good " (Gen. i. 31).

So far no parallel has been discovered in the Babylonian Epic to the creation of the creatures of the sea and of beasts, cattle, and creeping things, unless Tiâmat's brood of nine monsters corresponds to the creatures of the sea. But since, as Mr. King says, Berossus, in his Greek account of the Chaldean story of the creation, states that animals were created at the same time as man, it is probable that their creation was recorded in a missing portion of Tablet V. or VI. If, however, the account followed the lines indicated by the Greek writer, it is clear that their creation was narrated after that of mankind as a subsequent and less important episode; and there have indeed survived fragments of other Assyrian works in which the creation of fishes of the sea, beasts of the earth, and cattle, as well as of " creatures of the city," or domesticated animals, are mentioned.

The work of creation accomplished, Marduk divided the gods into two groups—the Igigi, or gods of the heavens and the upper world, and the Anunnaki, or gods of the lower world: the former were to be 600, the latter 50 in number. The gods in

gratitude then proposed to build for Marduk a great shrine somewhat like the tower of Babel, where they would all be able to assemble for the festival of the New Year. Marduk, delighted with their proposal, resolved at the same time to build the city of Babylon:

" So shall Babylon be (built) whose construction ye have desired;
The city shall be built, a fortified shrine shall be made ready."
(VI. 57-58)

After the building of Babylon and the great temple of Esagila by the great gods, they assembled at a banquet, and afterwards drew up laws for the governance of the universe, and divided the power among themselves. Then Marduk laid down his weapons in their presence, and Anu, the god of heaven, taking his bow, bestowed upon it titles of honour, and fixed it in the heavens, saying:

" Long wood " is (its) first name; (its) second [name is] . . .
Its third name is " the Bow in heaven " . . .
He fixed its position [in the heavens] . . .
(VI. 89-91)

so that here, too, the Babylonians and Hebrews had a common legend, telling how the divine bow was fixed in heaven, with the difference that, while the Babylonians made Marduk's bow a star, the Hebrews regarded the rainbow as God's bow (Gen. ix. 8-17). The poem, then, from beginning as a religious account of the foundation of the world, like the story in Genesis, ended almost on the note of a national epic, like the *Aeneid*, with the foundation of the capital, Babylon, and of the central shrine of Babylonian worship. The last eighty lines of Tablet VI. are a hymn of praise addressed to Marduk, as also is Tablet VII., which seems to have been a later composition on the same theme, afterwards attached to the end of the Epic of Creation.

In Tablet VII. there is one important variation from the earlier narrative: the motive ascribed to Marduk for the creation of mankind is very different. He is there addressed in the following lines:

Lord of the pure curse, the giver of life to the dead,
Who had mercy upon the gods that were bound,
Who removed the yoke (imposed) upon the gods his foes,
Who created mankind for their ransom,
The compassionate, with whom is the giving of life:
May his word be established and not be forgotten.
(VII. 26-31)

The difficulty lies in line 29, in the words " for their ransom." To whom does the pronoun " their " refer—to the gods that

were bound, or to mankind? And what is the precise connotation of "ransom" in this passage? In answer to the first question, it must at once be said that syntactical considerations make it almost, if not quite, imperative to regard the pronoun "their" as referring to the gods; but it must be admitted that several distinguished scholars, notably Dr. Jensen and Prof. Langdon, take the opposite view. If this view is taken, that "for the ransom of mankind" is intended, the line must mean that Marduk created men in order to ransom them from evil, in order to exercise his power over evil by freeing them from evil spirits by means of his "pure incantation." This theory, though the syntax seems against it, yields possibly a more satisfactory sense than the other view; for it is difficult to see how the creation of mankind can have been regarded as taking place "for the ransom of the gods." Those who adopt that view hold, either, with Dr. Ungnad, that the gods were spared in order to rule over mankind, which would not have been necessary if mankind had not been created to be ruled by them, or, with Fr. Dhorme, that the gods were set free from their bonds by the intermediation of men (which must be supposed to have been related in the lost portion of Tablet V. [!]). In view of the linguistic problem, the writer prefers Dr. Ungnad's view, while admitting that there are serious difficulties on both sides.

In drawing attention to the close resemblances, both in language and in matter, that can be found in the Babylonian Epic of Creation and the Hebrew story of the same event, the writer does not wish to convey the impression that the Hebrews borrowed their account directly or even indirectly from the Babylonians, although the latter can be traced back many centuries earlier than the former, both in literature and in art. Both peoples were descended from a common Semitic ancestry, both spoke languages closely akin, and both undoubtedly migrated from a common home into their respective countries. When the various branches of the Semitic race went their different ways, they took with them a store of early legends which they developed, and upon which they worked under the influence of their respective environments and of the religious ideas which they developed, just as they formed their own peculiar dialects out of the original Semitic idiom. Both told a story of the creation in their own way—the one polytheistic and the other monotheistic; but the common origin of the ancient story, coloured in Babylonia by the doctrines of Babylonian religion, does not detract one whit from the moral and religious value of the Hebrew version. Similarly, the laws of Moses show clear traces of their affinity with the code of Khammurabi; but it

is not necessary to assume that Moses knew and used that code in drawing up his own precepts. The common features in the two codes are derived from the original laws and customs of the primitive Semites, before they had separated off from one another; the rest of their precepts were devised by Khammurabi and Moses respectively to suit the needs, on the one hand, of the advanced civilization of a people dwelling in cities, and, on the other hand, of a pastoral, theocratically organized horde of nomads. The value of each code to serve its own purposes is not impaired by the fact that common elements of proto-Semitic law can be found in both works.

G. R. Driver.

ST. PAUL'S APOSTOLIC COMMISSION

Introduction.

It has been often taken for granted that St. Paul dates his apostolic commission to the Gentiles from his vision of Our Lord on the road to Damascus. The object of this present paper is to show that this view is not warranted; but rather that he received a commission to the Jews of Syria, Cilicia, and Cyprus from the Apostles at Jerusalem, while his commission to the Gentiles, which was not locally limited, was given him by Our Lord in a vision in the Temple. Closely connected with this question is that of St. Paul's ordination, and it will be suggested that the vision at his conversion was not a substitute for the laying-on of hands, but that ordination was conferred either by Ananias, or by St. Peter or St. James previous to his journey to Tarsus. Some portion of the evidence must necessarily be derived from St. Paul's conduct and writings subsequently to these events, so that it will be needful to consider at least the earlier portion of his ministerial life.

St. Paul's Conversion.

The most detailed descriptions of this occur in St. Luke's account in Acts ix., and in St. Paul's speech in Jerusalem in Acts xxii. We can best see what it is that they assert by placing them side by side.

Chapter ix.	Chapter xxii.
4. He fell upon the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?	7. I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul Saul, why persecutest thou Me?
5. And he said, Who art thou,	8. And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me,

Lord ? And he (said), I am Jesus whom thou persecutest:

6. But rise and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest.

10. And I said, What shall I do, Lord; And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus: and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.

It is clear from these two narratives that there was no message then given to St. Paul directly touching any mission to the Gentiles. In his first epistle to the Corinthians he distinguishes this sight of Our Lord from any subsequent appearances in trance or vision, and ranks it on the same level with the appearances after the resurrection to the apostles and others which they saw with their bodily eyes. But though it was at that time a necessary qualification for the apostleship that a man should have seen Our Lord after His resurrection, this did not *ipso facto* constitute him an apostle, else not only would Joseph Barsabbas have been an apostle, but all the 500 brethren, among whom were possibly Judas Barsabbas, Barnabas, and Silas.

The next event of importance is the vision which St. Paul had in Damascus itself. " He hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands on him, that he might receive his sight " (Acts ix. 12).

And the third vision is that granted to Ananias (Acts ix. 13), in which the Lord said to him: " He is a chosen vessel to me to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake." This is an accidental corroboration of our argument, for the revelation of the sufferings has yet to be made.

Then we come to the message of Ananias to St. Paul: Ananias, laying his hands on him, said, " Brother Saul, the Lord (even) Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost," which is condensed in chap. xxii., " Ananias, a devout man according to the law, well reported of by all the Jews that dwelt there, came unto me, and standing by me said, Brother Saul, receive thy sight." In this second account it is obvious that some part of Ananias's message has been omitted; but it is possible also that even in the first account the actual works spoken have been abbreviated. The messages to Saul at his conversion say that he was to be told at Damascus what he was to do. It would seem, therefore, that some such statement either formed part of

what Ananias said to him, or else that he was instructed in Damascus as to what to do as occasion arose. At any rate, it is natural to suppose that while he was there, he submitted to Ananias's general direction, for we may, I think, take it for granted that Ananias was the leader, or at least a member, of the governing body of the local Christian community. The only effect of Ananias laying his hands on Saul which is definitely stated is the latter's recovery of his sight; but in the vision in which Our Lord appeared to Ananias he is instructed to lay hands on him not only for that purpose, but also that he may receive the Holy Ghost. I do not suppose that there is any doubt that St. Paul did receive the Holy Ghost through the laying-on of Ananias's hands; but, if so, Ananias must have occupied a high office in the Church. Philip, one of the Seven, did not lay on hands in Samaria, but the Apostolic Body sent Peter and John with full authority to take action in their name (viii. 14-17). St. Paul laid his hands on those whom he ordained, and Timothy and Titus were commissioned to do the same. We do not elsewhere read that the laying-on of hands preceded baptism, but the case of Cornelius shows that the Holy Ghost could be received before it, and St. Peter compares this with His coming on the Apostles (xi. 15). In short, this laying-on of hands must at least have been St. Paul's confirmation, and if we remember his regular practice of ordaining presbyters, possibly his own ordination also.

But when we compare these two accounts with that given in Acts xxvi. we find there no mention of Ananias at all. It is clear, therefore, that we have in this chapter a much condensed report. The beginning of it is very much like the previous accounts of St. Paul's conversion. "I heard a voice saying unto me in the Hebrew language, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goad. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But arise, and stand upon thy feet." If the narrative was complete it would doubtless continue, "And Saul arose from the earth . . . and they led him by the hand and brought him unto Damascus," as in chap. ix. But the whole history of what happened in Damascus has been omitted, and in place of it the narrative goes on: "For to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the gentiles unto whom I send thee."

Accordingly, we have here a very condensed narrative with considerable omissions, and it is therefore impossible to press it against the more detailed histories of chaps. ix. and xxii.,

which make it clear that the revelation to St. Paul of, what he was to do and to suffer, was subsequent to his arrival in Damascus, and therefore that his apostolic commission cannot be dated from his conversion.

After the laying-on of hands by Ananias, St. Paul " straightway in the synagogues proclaimed Jesus that He is the Son of God, and confounded the Jews (ix. 20). We have seen that Ananias was a devout keeper of the law, and well reported of by all the Jews in Damascus (xxii. 12). It is therefore practically certain that St. Paul, so long as he was in Damascus, did not exercise any ministry towards the Gentiles, and this affords some independent support to our argument that he had not yet received a commission towards them. In Gal. i. 1, we read: "An Apostle not from men, neither through man." St. Paul is here speaking of his apostleship to the Gentiles, and he denies that this came to him through Ananias or any other human intermediary. From Damascus he went into Arabia, and returned again to the city, from which he was persuaded to escape, and then went up to Jerusalem.

St. Paul in Jerusalem.

On his arrival at Jerusalem the disciples were at first afraid of him not believing that he was a Christian, but Barnabas stood sponsor for him, and introduced him to the apostles—that is, to St. Peter and St. James (Gal. i. 19), narrating the story of his conversion, and how boldly he had preached at Damascus. Being acknowledged as a member of the Church, he made Jerusalem a centre of evangelistic work in Judæa (Acts xxvi. 20, Rom. xv. 19), avoiding places where Christian organizations already existed (Gal. i. 22, Rom. xv. 20), and ministering especially to Greek-speaking Jews (Acts ix. 20). His uncompromising vigour aroused no little opposition, so that a plot was formed to kill him. Accordingly the brethren decided to send him away for the sake of his own safety, as he had already been sent away from Damascus, and was subsequently sent from Beroea. St. Paul himself might have been more than willing to suffer the same fate as St. Stephen (Acts xxi. 13), but the matter was decided for him by a vision in the temple (Acts xxii. 17-21), in which the Lord said unto him: " Get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for I will send thee (forth) (ἀποστελῶ σε ἐξαποστελῶ σε) far hence unto the Gentiles.

We have already seen that St. Paul exercised no commission to the Gentiles at his conversion, and that he claims that his commission towards them did not come from men, neither through man; hence he did not receive it through Ananias.

We have found also that in a much condensed report he claims to have heard from the Lord "delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles unto whom I send thee" (εἰς οὓς ἀποστελλω σε).

Can we resist the conclusion that St. Paul dates his apostolate to the Gentiles from the vision in the temple?

The Beginning of the Gentile Ministry.

In consequence of the attempts on his life the brethren, including Peter and John, the Lord's brother, sent him forth to Tarsus, and they sent forth Barnabas (ἐξαπέστειλαν) as far as Antioch (Acts xi. 22)—that is, they not merely dismissed them (ἀπελύσαν Acts xiii. 3), but gave them authority to act (*cf.* the mission of Peter and John to Samaria, "the Apostles in Jerusalem, hearing that Samaria had received the word of God ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην Acts viii. 14). Very possibly these two missions were not independent. St. Barnabas constantly shows a strong affection for St. Paul, and to the Apostles at Jerusalem he would be a sort of guarantee, and he was certainly regarded as head of the mission. Paul and Barnabas may therefore have travelled to Antioch together, going by ship as far as Seleucia; but while Paul continued his journey to Tarsus by land, Barnabas remained at Antioch, and this is possibly indicated by the word ἕως "as far as Antioch." St. Paul refers to this mission when he says, "I came into the regions (εἰς τὰ κλίματα) of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i. 21). Tarsus was the chief city of Cilicia, and Antioch of Syria, and Cilicia and Syria formed a single administrative unit, as is clear by Quirinius having jurisdiction over the two, and being in charge of the census in Palestine (Luke ii. 2) while holding a military command over the mountain district between Phrygia, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, and making war on the Homonadenses, who inhabited these parts. It is not improbable that included in the "regions" was the island of Cyprus, which is visible both from Cilicia and the Lebanon, which holds an obvious strategic position with regard to each, and formed with them a single province in the time of the Roman republic. In these districts there would be found Jewish Christians. There were certainly large Jewish colonies in all (Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, 36). After the persecution that arose about Stephen Christians travelled from Jerusalem to Cyprus and Antioch; Mnason the Cypriot was "an original convert" (Acts xxi. 16), and the Cilicians had a synagogue in Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9). It was to these Jewish Christians that Barnabas and Saul were sent, doubtless with

the letters of commendation, or they would have experienced the same difficulty that the latter found when he essayed to join himself to the brethren in Jerusalem. The idea of "credentials" was already current among the Jews, as we see in St. Paul's own case, and it is clear that it was no less necessary for Barnabas to have some sort of "mandate" to justify him in assuming the authoritative position which he seems to have taken at Antioch.

Leaving Antioch, Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek out Saul, and having found him brought him back with him. If with Westcott and Hort we read "Hellenists"—that is, Greek-speaking Jews—in Acts xi. 20, then the work of the two Apostles was probably confined to their former co-religionists, the class with which St. Paul had already attempted to reason in Jerusalem (ix. 29).

St. Paul's Second Visit to Jerusalem.

At Antioch Agabus signified by the Spirit the famine soon to occur, and the disciples determined to send ministration to the presbyters in Jerusalem, and did so, constituting Barnabas and Saul their envoys (ἀποστείλαντες διὰ χειρὸς. B. καὶ Σ). We do not know with any certainty whether any of the Apostolic College were in residence in Jerusalem; but even if they were they would not have the superintendence of finance (vi. 2). The appointment of the Seven was expressly made to relieve them of this burden, but it possesses several curious features. They are a body without a name. Nowhere in Scripture are they referred to as "the deacons." They are to be men not only of administrative ability (πλήρεις σοφίας), but also of spiritual power (πλήρεις πνεύματος)—a qualification which would seem unnecessary in mere finance officers—and the two whose history is narrated after their appointment, St. Stephen and St. Philip, take a marked lead in preaching and evangelization. Thirdly, they are also men who are to have testimony borne to them. And lastly, their election is not simply ratified by apostolic approval, but by ordination. They have the hands of the Apostles laid on them.

The primary object of their appointment to relieve the apostles of the distribution of money (vi. 2), especially as regards the poor widows, is called διακονία. Now, without for a moment denying that this word bears a very wide meaning, it is somewhat significant that it also seems to have a narrow, almost a technical, sense. Thus, of the brethren at Antioch making a collection for those in Judæa, it is said they each of them determined to send for ministration (εἰς διακονίαν),

and when Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem to Antioch they did so, having fulfilled their ministration (διακονίαν). So St. Paul writes to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 8), "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to save your having to contribute to my maintenance" (πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν διακονίαν). And so of the great collection he made throughout the churches, "Now I go to Jerusalem ministering (διακονῶν) to the saints" (Rom. xv. 25), and (2 Cor. viii. 19) "the brethren who were appointed to travel in the matter of the gracious gift which is ministered" (τῇ διακονουμένῃ). Now it is remarkable that in Acts xi. 30 the collection is said to be sent to the *presbyters* at Jerusalem, and in Acts xxi. 18, when St. Paul and the delegates have arrived with the much greater collection, it is noted that he went in unto James, and *all the presbyters* were present. We have no notice of the ordination of these presbyters, but there is no doubt that they were ordained. The qualifications of a presbyter in the pastoral epistles are much the same as for the Seven—external testimony, administrative ability, spiritual power, and if they have a gift of teaching, as was notably the case with St. Stephen and St. Philip, so much the more are they to be honoured; and we find them also performing functions in the matter of distribution of alms at Jerusalem identical with those of the Seven—that is, in qualification, in function, and in ordination they were alike. Moreover, it is impossible to imagine that St. Luke, a writer who is so careful to mark all new beginnings, could introduce the presbyters at Jerusalem casually for the first time in Acts xi. 30, unless he identified them with some class of ordained men, not apostles, whom he had already mentioned. I submit, therefore, that the Seven were the original body of presbyters at Jerusalem, and that their ordination formed the precedent for all subsequent ordinations. But if the special function which we find them performing was in connection with finance, if the collection made at Antioch was forwarded to the presbyters, then it is highly probable that those who presided over the collection of the money, as well as over its distribution, those who were sent as well as those who received, were also presbyters, and in that case the ordination of Barnabas and Saul would have preceded their mission to Cilicia and Syria.

We may gather, I think, that a movement of conversion had taken place in both districts, as it certainly had at Antioch (xi. 19-21), and that Barnabas and Saul were despatched to take charge of it (as Peter and John were to Samaria), and to organize it, and this organization would include the appointment of local presbyters after sufficient instruction, if they found any fit for that office. St. Paul appears to have set up

presbyters in every church. If he spent but a short time on the spot at a first visit, then he appointed them on a subsequent visit, or sent others to act in his place. If, on the other hand, he resided for any considerable period as seems to have been the case at Tarsus, then he would organize the church in this fashion before passing on. Probably, therefore, in accordance with his subsequent custom, he ordained presbyters there, and so set the Church on a well-established basis, as otherwise he would have been reluctant to leave with Barnabas, and would not have fulfilled the special mission with which he had been entrusted by the authorities at Jerusalem. It is therefore probable that not only had Barnabas and Saul the rank of presbyter already, but that they were also of status to lay hands on others.

F. J. Badcock.

(To be concluded.)

THE ATONEMENT

II.—CHRIST'S DEATH A SATISFACTION FOR SIN

[In an earlier article (October, 1923) entitled "The Content of Salvation," a starting-point for a discussion of the Atonement was found in the distinction drawn in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 13, 14) between "dead works" and the service of the living God. The former term was seen to denote the secular and self-centred life, which is without reference to man's true end of glorifying God; while the latter phrase pointed to the worshipful life as the special characteristic of the Christian. Three traits in this worshipful life were emphasized. It is marked by joyousness; motive is rated higher than conduct, and the whole of man's motive is claimed in it; and it is maintained and fostered by definite acts of worship. The contrast is that between life on the natural level, and life on the spiritual or supernatural level; and the question was asked, "how the change was and is effected from the secular life to the life of worship—how that Atonement was wrought which issues in the gift of communion with God."]

The line of approach to this question which will here be adopted is in part dictated by the foregoing argument. If we attempt to present the Atonement in the light of the life of the worship which it has made possible, the testimony with which we must concern ourselves is that of the characteristic form of worship; for it is here, if anywhere—in the communal acts by which the Christian society expresses and fertilizes, symbolizes and promotes, its life of worship—that we shall find the surest evidences to the fundamentals of its faith.* When certain ideas have persisted for centuries in the various Eucharistic liturgies

* It is significant that this large volume of evidence is wholly ignored in Dr. Rashdall's *Bampton Lectures*, which are otherwise so complete.

of the Church, and when they have over and over again invited and received reinterpretation from theologians, we may be fairly sure that we are dealing with something which lies very close to men's experience of life. The fact that they are "conventional," so far from entitling them to be dismissed, entitles them rather to particular attention.

The three elements in the conception of the Atonement which stand out most clearly in the Church's liturgies are well summed up in our own prayer of Consecration, where Christ's death is spoken of as a "sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The present article will be confined to the last of these terms. What it denotes is that Christ's sacrificial death is part of a *Theodicy*. By a Theodicy I mean a system of thought or plan of action intended to exhibit the justice of God in His dealings with mankind. The powerful operation of this element in the consciousness of the Christian community is clear from the course of the Thanksgiving which in all liturgies, though with peculiar fulness in those of the Eastern churches, serves as introduction to the main action of the service.* This Thanksgiving commonly opens with an enumeration of the attributes of God and a description of His heavenly glory; and there follows, either before or after the *Sanctus*, a recitation of His dealings with mankind. The creation of man in God's image was the culmination of His works of power, and the beginning of His works of mercy. He offered man His grace and all the blessings of His fellowship; and even though man turned his back on this offer by the Fall, and so blurred the Divine image, God still did not forsake him utterly, but continued to solicit him to return. Thus He gave him the Law, wrought miracles in his behalf, and sent him the Prophets. Finally, when all these instruments of education and discipline were foiled by man's self-will, He sent His only-begotten Son in the flesh to restore the lost image, to live and die for the remission of our sins, to pay our debts, to suffer punishment on our behalf, and to make atonement for us. The redeeming work of Christ, therefore, together with the Christian sacrifice which proclaimed before God and man the propitiatory significance of His Death, is set forth as the ground of that worshipful life which is the end of the whole action. God's purpose of establishing His kingdom, of endowing man with eternal life, of confirming him in obedience enriched by His own fellowship, is not frustrated by sin; but it is not frustrated only because satisfaction has been made for the sins of the world.

* By this I mean that part of the service which extends from the Oblation, through the Epiclesis, to the Communion.

This use of the term "satisfaction" and its cognates is a warning that we cannot dispense with the notion of penalty in the consideration of the problem of Atonement. The fact that punishment suggests to many minds something arbitrary, incalculable, or harsh is an index of how men have abused it, not of the thing in itself. In itself, punishment is the means by which a violated moral order takes the offender again into relation with itself. The ideal ruler in a society of moral beings does not so much punish as administer a penalty proportionate to the offence committed. His purpose is primarily and in the first instance to re-establish the threatened order, and to assert the righteousness which, failing that assertion, will be impaired and dissolved by repeated violation. In that sense the penalty is retributive, and it can be justified merely as an act of self-protection; though in that simple and primitive form it is the evidence, not of a strong, but of a weak government or ruler. The strong ruler, however, has a further purpose. He knows that the weakening of the moral order of which he is the guardian is to the detriment of all those for whom it exists and in whom it finds expression. He desires, therefore, to prevent offences in the future; and the penalties that he imposes will be so framed as to deter such offences. Such deterrent penalties may be of the kind that appeal only to the instinct of fear; or they may be so balanced and developed as to awaken the positive sentiments of awe and reverence. It was the custom of the Romans to incorporate in their laws and treaties a clause called the *sanctio*,* containing the penalties to which the parties were liable in the case of transgression; and the attachment of these penalties was as much a means of moral education as a deterrent of crime, so that the word *sacrosanct*—*i.e.*, protected by the death penalty—came to be a synonym for "inviolable." The penalty has become, that is to say, more than retributive; more even than deterrent or exemplary; it has become educative.†

Yet even so, the purpose of the ideal ruler is not fully achieved. In the measure in which he is alive to the possibilities of each individual in his commonwealth, he must desire that offenders themselves should come to resume their true place in it. In the act of punishment he has broken off those outward relationships of the offender which violated the moral order, and substituted for them a relationship of justice to the order itself. Further, he has strengthened by the exhibition of justice the inner reverence for the whole order felt by its

* *Cf.* Cicero, *Pro Balbo*, 33.

† *Cf.* the quotation from Clement of Alexandria in Rashdall's *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 231, n. 1.

other and law-abiding members. But his purpose is not complete until the offender himself comes to repentance. So long as the will and motive are untouched, the relationship of the guilty person to the moral order which has asserted its claim over him is an external one only. But a moral order, in proportion as its ideals are realized, must rest upon inward relationships, upon a concord of wills; and the more perfect the commonwealth the more it will aim, beyond and through punishment, at the restoration of this concord. The development of English criminal procedure has shown how this end has been increasingly borne in mind. The institution of special courts for children; the revolution in the character of reformatory schools; the principle that a man sentenced to death may not be executed if of unsound mind (even though he may have been sane at the time of the crime); the place reserved in the system for court missionaries and prison chaplains; even the solemn prayer with which the death-sentence itself concludes—these are all indications of the value which a civilized Christian community sets upon the conversion of the guilty to co-operation with the moral ends of society.

At the same time, the culprit's repentance does not mean a remission of the penalty. Frequently the payment of the penalty precedes repentance and induces it; and where the repentance must come first or not at all, as in the case of capital punishment, the result is not to make the penitent beg to be reprieved, but to enable him to accept his penalty with courage and hope. The governing power, that is to say, requires the penalty as satisfaction, even though it forgives the criminal; without that satisfaction, indeed, it does not forgive, but condones.

Once more, while justice requires that the guilty shall be punished, it does not always and necessarily require that the penalty shall be paid by the guilty. The earlier forms of punishment—the retributive and the deterrent—involve, no doubt, the infliction of pain or loss upon the culprit in person; but in the measure that the educative and redemptive ends of all penalty are emphasized, the possibilities of its representative or vicarious payment come to the fore. In the case of civil damages, for example, there is nothing to prevent the liability of the offender being met by a friend; and in some cases it is obviously suitable that they should be so. But in the case of criminal punishment, too, there is an analogy to this vicarious function. If the infliction of pain or loss be regarded as the "matter" of punishment, the severance of wrong relationships and the substitution of a relationship of justice as between the offender and the moral order may be regarded as its "form."

But these two aspects of the "form" of punishment are not wholly on the same footing. So far as the severance of wrong relationships is concerned, the purpose of punishment can exhaust itself in the suffering of the wrong-doers, and they are bound to pay that part of the penalty. But the case is otherwise with the relationship which is substituted. In the first place, as we have seen, the purpose of the governing power is not achieved until the guilty person has come to accept the new relationship with his will, and turned the external necessity into an inner righteousness. He may do that in simple reaction to the assertion of the claims of the moral order. But more often the process of Conversion is more complex. He has pride to overcome, and shame. It is here that others share the penalty with him, and can even bear it for him. Inevitably they share the penalty with him in so far as they have been bound to him by ties of affection or trust; but they bear it for him too, in proportion as their own distress and pain call out in them an even larger volume of active sympathy and encouragement. The disgrace of punishment may lead to a man being forsaken of his friends, in which case the penalty is more likely to be the occasion of remorse than of repentance. But let a man see that the disgrace has been felt to the full by those whom he loves, and that they regard it as just, and yet that, nevertheless, their love for him grows rather than diminishes—that they gather round him rather than scatter from him—and the conditions are such as to lead any but the irretrievable to repentance. For now the penalty becomes charged with a peculiar sweetness. From acknowledging justice with fear, he now comes to love it, because he sees that those in whom its exercise is reflected love him; and through their vicarious suffering of this part of his penalty, his soul is cleansed and his conscience acquitted.

This analysis of the idea of satisfaction for sin has been necessary, if we were to show that it was one which the theology of the Atonement could not dispense with. We need not dispute Dr. Rashdall's criticism that Anselm's exposition of it was marred by "barbaric" notions of justice and by the fatal identification of "moral transgression with personal affront."* But the idea itself is not so easily disposed of. When Dr. Rashdall writes that "the theory of Anselm has the merit of recognizing that God must act according to the highest ideas of justice, and of acknowledging that we have no right to pronounce just in God what would have seemed the highest injustice in men,"† he is emphasizing the very point which makes *some* doctrine of satisfaction for sin indispensable.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 355. † *Ib.*, p. 356.

Nowhere in his great book, so far as I can discover, does Dr. Rashdall really face the problem which sin involves for those who believe in God as the moral Governor of the universe. Yet that is what Scripture, in the highest reaches of its development, means by monotheism; and it is in the light of that belief in God, as Lord as well as Father, that the Church has seen the issues of sin and of redemption.

Let us apply, then, our analogy from what we know of moral government, and of the place of punishment in it, in human society. Christian Revelation sets the creation before us as in God's design and end a spiritual and moral order, in which each element answers to His will. His fundamental purpose is the production and maintenance of that order. Sin has partially, but only partially, violated it. The "heavenly commonwealth" still exists, even though men and even angels* have transgressed its laws. It exists not only in that hierarchy of spiritual beings who have never fallen from their first estate, or who, having fallen, have "washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb," but also, though crossed and thwarted and obscured by other relationships, in mankind himself, in so far as men are still alive to the solicitations of grace and can hear the voice of conscience. Indeed, the first work of the moral consciousness is to testify to the existence of that perfect order and to its abiding and inviolable strength. Further, the maintenance and manifestation of that order are prior, in man's purpose as well as in God's, to the need of individual redemption; for it is only in so far as we believe in it and hold fast to it, that we can either desire or hope to be redeemed. The motive that above all draws men to repent is the thought of home, with all the moral security the word denotes; and we cannot begin our repentance until we have apprehended (however dimly) that secure and stable relationship as its end.

The constitution of the world being, therefore, a moral order, and its purpose the maintenance and realization of that order in the obedience of its several members, human analogy leads us to suppose that the transgression of its laws will entail punishment. It is not a question of imparting to myriads of descendants the sin of one. What the Fall signifies is that at some critical point, or series of points, in the evolution of mankind, the human race "took a wrong turn," and contracted relationships and loyalties which were off the true path of development. Original sin† is the name given to the false loyalties so acquired, and to the innate tendencies resulting

* The fall of angels is most powerfully expounded in William Law's *The Spirit of Prayer*.

† I should like to express my debt to Preb. Bicknell's *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin*, and to Dr. James Orr's *Sin as a Problem of To-day*.

from them. Further, it is wholly contrary to the teachings of natural science to suppose that the consequences of so fundamental a step in the evolutionary process can be annulled by any act of an individual. Nowhere, indeed, are the abiding consequences of action or happening so consistently taught as in the book of Nature. There we see how processes, once set in motion, work themselves out to cosmic dimensions; and we cannot suppose that that act or series of acts, by which Man chose to be a child of Nature rather than a son of God, and preferred to satisfy his instincts of pride and curiosity rather than enter into the heavenly fellowship, is any exception to the rule. Those consequences are what constitute for theology Man's punishment. They are the penalty established in the order of things; no arbitrary act of God, but the operation of laws long established and tried in His government of the world, and known to their first transgressors by virtue of their likeness to God.

The inspired writers of Israel found these consequences particularly in three universal conditions of human life—in toil, sickness, and death. This doctrine should not be regarded as a final revelation of the truth, but as proportionate to the general context of religious ideas which prevailed at the time. It is difficult to believe, for instance, that Man could ever have been exempt from the mortality which appears to belong to all physical organisms. Nevertheless, this intuition, though partial, was true so far as it went, and its utterances have symbolic value. For toil and sickness represent human experiences which attach to man by virtue of his relation to nature, and yet are not the normal lot of the brute creation; while death, though it comes to beast and man alike, is in his case surcharged with elements of pain and fear which animals are apparently spared.* What is true of all these experiences in man's case is that they are experiences of weakness, disharmony, loss—the very negation of that self-sufficiency the claim to which constituted his "first disobedience." Blazoning before his eyes the instability of those false loyalties contracted by the Fall, they are superbly adapted to the ends of punishments conceived as the annulling of wrong relationships and the assertion of the true. *On jette enfin de la terre sur la tête, et en voilà pour jamais.*†

Pour jamais? If Nature have her perfect work, why not? Nothing in Nature can suggest that the loss should not be final: opportunities once lost, in that realm, do not return. And for many centuries Hebrew religion only passed very

* See the quotations from scientific writers in Dr. Harris's *Pro Fide*, pp. 216 ff. (3rd edition).

† Pascal, *Pensées*, 210.

imperfectly beyond that idea. They did envisage a continuance, but it was a continuance in Sheol, a shadow existence like that in Homer's *Nekuia*, with all that makes life worth living lost. Yet the religious consciousness could not rest there. The satisfaction for sin required by ethical monotheism was gained at too great expense to the very purpose of that moral order which God governed. And so, gradually, as the necessity of Divine mediation and redemptive action emerges, belief in a Resurrection emerges with it. Sheol is not final; there will be a discrimination and a revival, a new life for the just, and a second death for sinners. Glimpses of heaven and hell are all that the Old Testament gives us; but they are the symptoms of a new unveiling of reality, the opening up of supernature as the end of Nature, the suggestion of eternal life as the key to the mysteries of life in time. Christianity came to crown this revelation, and to unite all its broken and scattered rays in one effulgent light.

First, it illuminated death. "The wages of sin is death"—Aeschylus, like St. Paul, had said that. But "the sting of death is sin"—that was a new message. What stings is not so much death, as the fact that death is the execution of a sentence of mortality, which is inexorably just. And that same justice demands that it shall be final. In the measure in which the soul awakes to the possibilities of eternal life, it becomes aware that it merits (unless the natural order be a fraud) the "bitter pains of eternal death." Those experiences that surround the departing soul—the dissolution of dear ties, the loneliness of the road, the branding of life with futility, the sense of purpose unfinished and hope foreclosed—these are the reality. *On mourra seul.** They are the consequences of man's moral condition, of the wrong relationships which he was born into, and which he has so often voluntarily endorsed. They are penal in that sense of the word punishment already defined. They contain the "matter" of punishment, in that they are experiences of loss and pain. They contain its "form" in that they mean the decisive severance of the loyalites of sin, and the substitution of a relationship of justice, of expiation, in their place.

And yet, if that be all, it is a maimed and imperfect justice that is established. It is maimed and imperfect, because it is not victorious; the purpose of Creation as a moral order is thwarted if a mere continuance in limbo be the term of men's existence. It is maimed and imperfect, moreover, in that the further end of punishment, which is repentance, cannot be realized.

* Pascal, *Pensées*, 211.

That is the point at which the mediation of Christ and His vicarious satisfaction for sin manifest themselves as the hinge of our whole theodicy, as the act of God in which His just and merciful Love are supremely realized and made plain. The Gospel declares that He paid the penalty for us. That which according to the moral rationality of the universe (which is God's law) we merited, He "voluntarily suffered." On our behalf He endured not only the full human experience of death, but also all of loss that our experience of it portends. He "suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell." The Church has never isolated Christ's Death from His Passion; has dwelt lovingly on every detail of His Agony before the Cross, and on His burial after it; can never omit, even while it cannot fully interpret, His descent into the twilight-life of "Hades." Pascal has caught the meaning of it with inimitable insight in that inspired meditation entitled *Le Mystère de Jésus*.* All that death can mean of complete loneliness and failure and expiatory loss, Jesus entered into and took into His own experience. One of His chosen disciples is a traitor; three sleep; all flee; one denies Him. The comfort of fellowship comes to Him for a moment from the penitence of a thief; until all hope is dashed, and He feels Himself forsaken even of God. Then in that dark night of the soul He cries aloud, "It is finished." The cup of Man's punishment has been drunk, and all the extremity of his loss experienced. Be it so. In that place of "eternal death" He will do out the duty and fulfil the justice of God. Into His hands He commends His spirit.

And this was "for us men and for our salvation." He bore the penalty common to all, that all who accepted His work might be spared it. In the natural and moral order of things all must perish and fail of salvation; but He could pay the penalty of all—the One for the many—by virtue of the Incarnation. Perfect Man, He could enter into the whole sum of human experiences: Perfect God, He could follow out those experiences to their final issues in the sphere of the invisible realities. Man could but "add one to one" in the tale of the great satisfaction for sin: Jesus could and did encompass it in His one life and death. So was the righteousness of God's government vindicated.

But, though vindicated, it was not yet victorious. It has often been pointed out that the writers of the New Testament, and particularly St. Paul, rarely speak of Christ's Death without combining with it the thought of His Resurrection. He "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our

* *Pensées*, 553

justification "*—that is the true balance of the doctrine of the Atonement. For Christ's Resurrection showed that death might be the gate of life. Penal for Him, it ceased to be penal for Man; its " sting " was gone. Defeated in His case, its finality for all men was shattered. Jesus, by His rising from the dead, " brought life and immortality to light "—life, because the way was open for the supernatural fellowship with God, through the annulling of " the ordinances that were against us "; immortality, because the law of death, no less than the law of sin, was transcended (Rom. viii. 2). Thus was redemption purchased; and Man, only believing and penitent, can enter on the worshipful life in which His salvation consists.

Finally, this redemptive and revealing act of God in Christ has exercised, as was inevitable, a powerful reflex influence upon the attitude of believers towards those experiences of toil, sickness, and death which had been particularly identified with punishment for sin. They are still common to man's lot, but for Christians their significance is changed. It has often been pointed out how the pessimism of the ancient world, so pronounced in the Greek tragedians and in the Stoics, was gradually overcome by the hope and joy which derived from Christianity; and it is still the experience of the ever-growing Church—in India, in Africa, in the South Sea Islands—that the Gospel of Christ gives men " beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness " (Is. lx. 3). If in Europe, the cradle of Christendom, we seem to-day to lie under thick clouds of despair, we yet know that the cause is not in the ultimate conditions of life itself, but in our misuse of life. For toil, which to the non-Christian seems to betoken either vassalage or vanity, has become to the believer the fulfilment of a probation and the discharge of a trust. Sickness, instead of indicating the disfavour of heavenly or supernatural powers, has become the focus of love and sympathy and the opportunity of growth in the spirit—a divine visitation, but a visitation of potential blessing. And Death, so far from being the sentence of nullity on human striving, has become a bed of hope for God's people, its bereavements tempered by the expectation of reunion, its silence by the sound of the trumpets on the other side, its loneliness by the comfort of the *viaticum* and the Word of God.

To sum up. Christ's Death is a satisfaction for sin, in that it represents His complete entrance on Man's behalf into those experiences of mortality which are the consequences of Man's sin. These consequences present themselves as such as we should expect from the analogy of what we know of the processes

* Rom. iv. 25.

of evolution; and because the order of Nature in which they occur is a moral order and rests upon the Will of God, they are properly regarded as punishment or satisfaction for sin. In the government of human societies, the "matter" of punishment consists in pain or loss, and its "form" in the severance of wrong relationships and the substitution for them of a relationship of justice; but the end of government is not fully attained until the guilty person comes to repentance, and thereby embraces his penalty as a means of expiation. Moreover, room is left in civil procedure for the vicarious payment of the penalty, and in criminal cases for a participation by the innocent in the pain of punishment, which is often found to provide the strongest motive for the transgressor's repentance. In God's government of the world the Hebrew doctrine that toil, disease, and death were the penalty for sin prepared the way for those keener intuitions of the supernatural issues of life which characterized later Judaism and were finally developed in Christianity. On this background the experiences of mortality appeared as the premonitions of a finality of loss which was inexorably just, and their penal sting was enhanced. What Christ did was to enter, by His Passion, Death, and Descent into hell, into the reality of loss so adumbrated; to suffer it as Man for men, that we might not suffer it to whom it was justly due; and by His resurrection from the dead to break death's spell upon the soul, to show it as the gate of life for those who believed, and to open the way of repentance for all mankind. The ground of God's forgiveness was thus established and revealed, and the life of true worship, in which consists salvation, was restored to the world.

The purpose of this article is constructive rather than controversial; none the less, its relation to the Abelardian view, so ably urged by Dr. Rashdall, may perhaps be noted in conclusion. When Dr. Rashdall says that repentance was

> "the only condition of salvation while Christ was yet on earth; and in the whole range of our Lord's other teaching there is not the shadow or shade of a suggestion that the offer of salvation made to man while He was yet on earth was to be withdrawn, or narrowed, or saddled with fresh conditions in consequence of, or subsequently to, His death."* . . .

we need not dispute the statement.† Nor do we in the least obscure or extenuate the lesson of the parable of the Prodigal Son, with its stress upon repentance and its revelation of the Father's welcome to the penitent. But the whole of its lesson must be learnt. What moves the Prodigal to repentance is

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 26, 27.

† Except in one particular. Our Lord does lay down one "condition" of God's forgiveness of us—*i.e.*, our readiness to forgive others.

first the fact that he has drunk to the full the consequences of his rebellion, and next the haunting memory of a secure and stable home where dwelt justice and love. These features interpose no fresh "condition" of forgiveness, but they are wholly consistent with such a Theodicy as has been adumbrated above. It is not a question of the condition of forgiveness, but of its ground; and when Jesus uttered the parable of the Prodigal Son, He had no need to emphasize that, seeing that it was none other but Himself. On the other hand, when simplified as Dr. Rashdall simplifies it, the doctrine of the Atonement becomes self-destructive; for it weakens the main motive for repentance. That motive is the vision of One who is Just, as well as Loving; who governs the world in Righteousness even while He pardons the sinner; who does not cease to be the Almighty Lord when He reveals Himself as Father. Moreover, only such a revelation can afford a motive, not only for repentance, but for the preaching of it. The message which the Apostles took into the Gentile world was not simply a message of Divine forgiveness; for few felt any need of forgiveness. It was first of all a message about God—about His Holiness, His Kingdom, His purpose for man; about sin and its satisfaction; and only then about grace and eternal life. In other words, it was a Theodicy; and it was to those who accepted this Theodicy that they taught Christ's story of the Prodigal Son.

E. G. Selwyn.

(*To be concluded.*)

TRAINING AND TRUE PRIEST-CRAFT

When you have worked in the Church overseas for a good many years and then return to work in the Church in England, one of the contrasts which strikes you most forcibly is the number of clergy, churches, organizations, and professing Christians at home as compared with what you have been used to overseas. The contrast is tremendous, so much so that the wonder is why England is not far more really Christian than it is, and why incidentally, and with all this wealth of potential spiritual power and material means, the Church overseas should ever be starved, as it is, of man-power and munitions of war.

There is certainly an immense amount of Christianity about in England, but for the most part it is so diffused, so nebulous, so uninstructed, that it seems to lack just that bite and fire and "punch," as the Americans call it, to make it really effective. As Bishop Gore has continually reminded us for years past, the need here in England especially is not so much

for more Christians as for better ones. If even 50 per cent. of the two to three million Communicants of the Church of England were really converted and instructed Christians, we should hear very little more of empty churches or of the lack of missionary enterprise at home or overseas, or of the poverty of the Clergy, or of the shortage of their number. Things would move, for the Holy Spirit would be given a real chance of doing His work.

For my part I believe the one thing needful to-day is to get back more and more to Our Lord's methods. He worked from the centre outwards. He had a glorious disregard of numbers—quantity counted little with Him: quality everything. He made his appeal to all and sundry; He cast his net wide, but the net was wide-meshed, only a few were brought to land; from these few he carefully selected those who, in His judgment, were likely to be the men and women worth teaching and training as the nucleus through which He would work.

These He taught and trained with immense care and patience; together, but always individually. He taught them the right ideas about God and Man, the World, the Church, Prayer, Sacrament, and Life. He trained them in personal dependence upon Himself, and in fellowship one with another. He trained them practically, by sending them out, experimentally, while He was still with them, to pass on to others what they had themselves learned. "Lord, teach us to pray," and He taught them. He took them into Retreat with Himself; He filled them up and sent them out. They went, they lived, they taught, they witnessed, and worked, and, as far as one can see, on the same method: always from the centre outwards. They selected and chose; they gathered round them their nucleus; they taught and trained their converts, not to be a little self-centred family party, but workers and missionaries —living witnesses before men of the Faith which had changed their own lives and given them a new Vision and a new Power. And so the Church spread and grew.

That, I am convinced, is the method which we must get back to in the Church of England, if we are ever to make the widely diffused Christianity, which is characteristic of the country to-day, really effective for the winning of the world for Christ.

And first we must begin with ourselves, Bishops and Clergy, and then with the faithful laity, the men and women who, we can assume, do mean business by their religion, by being more or less regular Communicants.

We have heard a good deal lately of the shortage of clergy.

It is no doubt very real and obviously very serious. It is more or less a new experience as far as England is concerned, but to anyone who has to do with the Church overseas it has long been a commonplace. Even to-day, serious as the shortage of Clergy is in many parts of England, it is nothing compared with the shortage in Africa, India, China, and Japan, and, indeed, in any other part of the non-Christian world; it is well for us at home to remember this fact.

Now, there are no doubt many causes for this shortage, but I believe one of the most serious is not the financial question (serious as that is), but the fact that many full-blooded, keen men who might conceivably take Holy Orders and make first-rate parsons are not attracted by the work of a Priest in the Church of England, because that work does not appear, either to be, or to be taken as, a really serious profession. As compared, for instance, with the profession of Medicine or Law, the demands made upon those who would adopt it seem to be far less both in time and in intensity; and once a man has been ordained Priest, no further demands for continued study or increased efficiency are apparently expected, and certainly not made. Can a profession of such a kind be really worth it? Besides, what is the ordinary idea of a Parson's work? Surely it is something of this kind: to take a considerable number of services which apparently any layman could take just as effectively with the minimum of preparation or training; to preach a large number of sermons which, judging from the comments which "our might-be Parson" hears thereon, nobody, except possibly a few old ladies, ever want to hear; to visit the sick (if they are not, in the opinion of the medical man, too seriously ill), not apparently with any idea of helping them to recover, but merely to—well, what? Or in very serious cases which are quite hopeless to prepare them to die, or to bury them when dead. Further, to perform such ceremonies as marriages and baptisms, and to organize Sunday Schools (which few people seem to take seriously) and Sunday School treats, and possibly run a troop of scouts, or get somebody else to do so, and drink innumerable cups of tea at innumerable houses with the women folk, when real men are at work, or ought to be.

Can this really be a profession for a full-blooded, intelligent man?

If this is the true account of it (which in theory it is not, but in practice it has a way of becoming) obviously not: it is not a man's job, and better be left alone. But if there is real and serious work to be done by the Clergy, then surely the profession would be taken more seriously than it is, and greater

demands would be made upon those who would undertake it, in test of character, ability, study, and efficiency, both before and after Ordination ?

I believe myself that we shall never get the quantity of clergy that we need for service at home or overseas until we have materially increased the standard of quality, and this we shall never do until we have made greater demands for a higher standard of general efficiency and competency, not only upon those who would be, but also upon those who have been, ordained.

An officer in H.M. Army or Navy is commissioned not only to be a fighting man himself, but to be a trainer, teacher, and leader of other fighting men. A physician is licensed to cure the bodies of men and to keep them healthy. And a Priest is commissioned to cure the souls of men and to keep them healthy.

Theoretically this is plain enough: " the cure and care of souls," that is what he is a Priest for, but not only that: he is " ordained " or " commissioned " to be a fighting man, and to be a teacher and a trainer and leader of other fighting men (and women) who have been entered at baptism on the nominal roll of the Army of the King of Kings, " to fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and continue His faithful soldiers and servants unto their lives' end." That is the work of a Priest—or should be. He combines in the spiritual and moral spheres the work which in the material and physical spheres is expected of an officer in the Army and a Physician of men's bodies.

Viewed in that way, the profession of a Priest cannot at least be said to be a petty affair: it should be, and can be, the most serious and the most exacting of all professions. It may well be rejected as a profession to adopt for many reasons, but never, if rightly understood, on the score that " it is not a man's job."

The need to-day, it seems to me, is that we should recover this true idea of what the work of a Priest in the Church of God really is. The word Priest-Craft has in the minds of the average Englishman sinister and ugly associations, but true Priest-Craft is exactly what we need to recover if we are to attract the best and ablest men to this work, and if we are to make this diffused Christianity of England to-day really effective for winning both England and the world for Christ.

We Bishops and Clergy must cease to be (what alas ! too many of us are) just well-meaning but extraordinarily ineffective amateurs at our business in life; we must become professional in the best and widest sense of that term. We must take ourselves and our profession far more seriously than

we have done. When we ourselves do so, there will be a greater chance of others doing likewise. We must know how to " cure " and to " care for " the souls of men: to cure them when sick, and to keep them healthy when comparatively well: to diagnose moral and spiritual disease, and to treat it.

We are sent to be Teachers of the Faith; we must know it ourselves before we can teach it to others, and know it not as somebody else knew it a thousand, or even a hundred, years ago, but know it and be able to express it " in the vulgar tongue," in the language, and in the mode of thought of to-day. To do this we must acquaint ourselves to the best of our ability with the work of those philosophers and theologians who, in the light of modern knowledge, are seeking to reinterpret the Faith once delivered to the Saints, for our business is to win men and women to Christ.

And not only Teachers, but Trainers of men, women, and children in the profession of being Christians: trainers of fighters, men capable of teaching and training others in the use of those weapons of spiritual warfare which God has put into our hands: trainers in the manifold enterprise of the science and art and practice of prayer and communion with God.

And not only Teachers and Trainers, but Leaders. Leadership no doubt is a gift, and without something of it I doubt whether any man has a vocation to the Priesthood, except perhaps for certain very specialized branches of that work. But the gift of leadership, like any other, can be, and indeed must be, developed if it is to be of any effective service to God and Man.

Now, if I am right in my general estimate of the work of a Priest in the Church of God, then it is obvious that it is a most exacting and most scientific profession, demanding a very careful preliminary preparation and training, and continuous further study after ordination.

First, then, with regard to the preliminary preparation and training of candidates for Holy Orders. A general education of a University type should be an essential part of it. The man must learn to think and to tackle a subject intelligently, and be brought as far as possible into contact with other men studying other serious subjects. I do not believe in a candidate for Holy Orders taking Theology as his " School " for his degree; by all means let him read theology as a second post-graduate course, but he should not specialize too soon.

After his University Course I should like to see every candidate for the Priesthood earn his own living as an ordinary adult layman for at least a year, if not more, in order that he

may obtain first-hand experience of how adult laymen live, and of the difficulties which they have in making their religious life come first in their secular calling. The trouble with so many Clergy is just this: they have never had any experience of being adult laymen: public school boys, university undergraduates, yes; and in some cases theological college students, but not adult laymen. It is a great miss, and can never afterwards be entirely made good.

Then he should have a two years' course at a theological college. If he is to be a curer and carer of the souls of other men, he must learn something about curing and caring for his own. If he is to teach and train others in the art and science and practice of prayer and communion, he must first learn something of it himself. This he will be able to do better in the atmosphere and comradeship of a theological college than anywhere else. I am well aware of the financial difficulties, but once we can persuade the rank and file of Church-folk that a well-trained ministry is of paramount importance the money will come, of that I am confident.

But preliminary training is not enough; it is the post-ordination education of the Clergy which seems to me to be of equal, if not even greater, importance. It is only after we have been at the real thing for a few years that we realize what there is to be learned. It is then that we should be learning, and for the most part we are not doing so.

It is no good for Bishops and others merely to exhort their Clergy to be faithful to their ordination vows, and study: we have enough exhortation in the Church as it is, we want something more. The fact is, it is a very difficult business for Clergy to continue the study of their profession in any really systematic way: they want practical help and guidance. The average country Parson to-day not only finds it difficult to buy books, but still more difficult to read them, for he has few at hand to stimulate him to do so. The town parson is too "busy" to read—at least, it is perilously easy for him to think so. And, after all, most of us who are not naturally students do require some human stimulus to make the necessary effort to go on with our studies and be prepared to learn new and possibly better methods.

A Bishop of the Diocese is primarily set there to be a Father-in-God to his people, and first of all to his clergy. He is commissioned to be a teacher of the faith: it is his primary business to be so, or at least to provide for this adequate teaching. The post-ordination education of the clergy should be his first concern.

Two things it seems to me are necessary. First, a chance

should be given to all the clergy in the Diocese every year to attend a "school," where lectures should be given on two or three different subjects by men who are experts in them. A group of forty or fifty clergy attending such a "school," living together for four or five days under the same roof, and taking their part not only in listening to the lectures, but also in the discussions which follow, would get, as it has been shown by experience, just that fresh intellectual stimulus which would help them to go back to their work, not only with new ideas, but with the desire for further study. Secondly, every such "school" should be followed by a definite course or courses of study, with a clear syllabus of the subject set out, and definite suggestions of books to be read.

These courses of study should be organized in groups of eight to ten Clergy accessible to one another, and they should, I believe, be conducted on the study-circle principle. That is to say, the groups should meet at least once a week for a period of, say, six or eight weeks: longer intervals are hopeless. The leader (and he should be a picked man who has, if possible, attended a special school for leaders of study groups) should see that to each member of the group a definite question or questions (such as would be set in an examination paper on the subject) should be assigned for each meeting of the group.

The shy man and the halting in speech could bring his answer written out if he so wished, but anyway each would bring his own contribution to the general discussion: nobody would be left out. The ubiquitous "gas-bag" would not monopolize all the time, and the unlearned would have his chance. All the members of the group would be provided with *all* the questions, so that each would not only know a good deal about his own assignment, but something of the assignments of the others, and by the end of the course each member of the group would have done some real study for himself, and through the corporate discussions would have learned a good deal more besides.

There should, I think, be two such courses in the year: one, say, in the autumn, and one in the late spring.

As I have already said, the group should not be too large: eight, or at the most ten, are quite enough; once the numbers get much larger, the discussions become less effective, and the duller or shyer members of the group get left out. It is, I believe, essential that the study group should meet at least once a week, and for a definite number of weeks. By meeting once a week the interest in the subject and the discussions is maintained, and the members of the group can with due notice arrange to keep those days free from all other engage-

ments, and should any member be unavoidably prevented from coming to one meeting, he will be able to pick up the threads more easily in a fortnight's time than after the lapse of two months.

I know well enough how difficult it is to get some clergy to take such things seriously enough, not to let trivial engagements interfere with their attendance, but it has, I think, been proved by experience that when the course covers six or eight weeks running, the attendance is better than when spread over a much longer period; while, if each member of the group feels that the rest of the group is dependent upon him for his particular contribution, there is an added incentive to him to be regular in his attendance.

Much will depend on the care which is taken by those responsible in the Diocese for the arrangement of the courses of study and the " assignments " or " questions " set out in the syllabus of the course.

The Central Society for Sacred Study has already done much for the Post-Ordination Education of the Clergy, but I believe those who have given so much time and thought to this work in the past could do even more than they have already done if there was a much closer co-operation between them and the Diocesan Staff for Instruction in each Diocese.

So much, then, for the moment with regard to the possibilities of helping forward the post-ordination education of the clergy—but what of the laity ?

Even if we could be generally satisfied (which, as a fact, I do not think we can be) with the teaching given to our children in day or Sunday schools, in Confirmation classes, or in the years immediately following Confirmation, surely there is great need for tackling in a systematic way the question of Adult Religious Education ?

If we are to get back to Our Lord's methods, we must face this question in a practical way. Theoretically, I suppose, we should say that the sermons on Sundays and occasional " addresses " in the week, and our special courses in Lent or Advent, should be our opportunities for instructing our adults in the Faith; but what do they come to ?

Take the Sunday sermons. By our custom of mixing up worship and instruction, we first of all tire out our " class " by what should be quite serious devotional exercises: having done so, we then proceed " to instruct " them; but our time is strictly limited; our audience is rather, or very, weary; it is also very mixed, containing every sort of person of every sort of age, intelligence, outlook, and education. They listen or go to sleep, but even if they listen, how many of us are capable of

taking away with us any very serious continuous argument or instruction without the aid of notes taken to remind us afterwards and to help us to follow out the line of thought for ourselves ?

What teacher of any serious subject, such as biology, botany, history, mathematics, philosophy, or literature, would be content to confine his teaching to twenty minutes at a time at intervals of a week or more to a mixed and ungraded class already wearied out by other mental exercises, and with no facilities for taking any notes of his lectures ?

We all know, as a fact, what this ridiculous method has led to: it has led to clergy getting up in the pulpit and exhorting people to be good, and producing a few commonplace moral maxims, or enumerating certain profound truths of the Christian Faith, and telling people that they must believe them. "Telling people to be good"—that really is at the bottom of a great deal of our troubles to-day; and we never have the time or the opportunity (even if we could take it when we got it) of telling people *how* to be good, or in what goodness really consists, which is, after all, the message of Christ.

The fact is, that so far as the Church itself is concerned, the average adult Christian does not get any real systematic teaching, instruction or training in the Christian Faith and Life after he has been confirmed: the consequence is, that unless he gets it for himself he stands still, he stagnates, he forgets even what he did learn, his religious life is unprogressive, it soon ceases to mean anything to himself, and is therefore of little consequence to anyone else: he becomes an "ineffective," or, as we used to say in the war, a "nuff," meaning a person who was "no use for fighting."

To get back to Our Lord's methods we ought, in every parish, to be selecting the men and women who, as far as we can judge, should, with teaching and training, become the most effective "missionaries" of the faith: having selected them, we should be setting ourselves to teach and train them to become so by a systematic and intensive course or courses, just in the same way as during the Great War both officers and men were trained to become effective leaders and fighters in the new methods of warfare which were constantly being devised. They were continually being sent back from the line to Schools of Instruction.

Here, again, I believe that the study-circle system is the best. That system may have to be modified to meet special cases, but it is based on the sound principle—viz., that of making students study, work, and think for themselves; and that is exactly what we want to get our Communicants to do.

The Parish Priest should train himself to be a leader of such study groups. The groups should be graded according to the general standard of education, intelligence, and age. There are, it seems to me, two main lines of teaching needed: they are what I would call the theoretical and the practical; they must go hand in hand.

On the theoretical side our aim should be to teach definitely and systematically the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. There is to-day a widespread ignorance of these matters, and not least among parents; the consequence is, that many of our children are brought up from their earliest years with un-Christian ideas of God, of Man, of the Human Race, of Prayer, Sacrament, etc. On what I would call the practical side our aim should be to teach our students not only the Christian theory of Prayer, Intercession, Meditation, etc., but practically *how* to pray, *how* to intercede, and *how* to meditate.

That is what men and women want to-day. They want to know how they can use the weapons, as it were, of their spiritual warfare—how they can become effective "spiritual bombers and gunners."

Again, such courses should cover a definite number of weeks, say six or eight, and be held during that time fairly frequently. But in addition to such ordinary parochial courses, opportunities should be given to attend Central Diocesan Schools of Instruction for two or three days at a time, or longer if possible. These "schools" should be residential—that is to say, they should be held in the Central Diocesan House, all attending them living under the same roof, taking part in common worship, common meals, and common recreation.

Even in a week-end spent in this way, a man or woman probably will learn more of what the fellowship and comradeship of the Church ought to mean than in any other way imaginable, and in talk and discussion and common prayer and worship they would learn a great deal more besides.

Besides such "schools," arrangements would be made for Retreats and Retreat Conferences for the development of the devotional side of the Christian life. There is no reason why (as has already been done in some cases) a parish should not take the Diocesan House for a Parish Retreat, where the Parish Priest and his real workers, men and women, could go apart together to take stock and take in, that together they might go back and give out more effectively as a corporate body in their own parish.

But for this and for the Post-Ordination education of the clergy, one thing I believe is absolutely essential, and that is—

the provision of one or more Communal Houses in each diocese, capable of housing comfortably, say, thirty to forty with adequate accommodation for worship, lectures, and feeding.

I say "comfortable" advisedly, because I believe such a diocesan house should be a real home, furnished simply, but in the best possible taste, and not just a barrack furnished by gifts from jumble sales, and "any old thing" that nobody wants. For to it would come for times of refreshment and stimulus groups from all kinds of folk: your factory girl and factory lad; your "working" man, and your "city" man; your cottager mother and your Duchess; your hunting man and your gamekeeper; your clerk and his wife from a cramped suburban villa with its over-flowing brood of noisy children, and your over-strained rescue worker or parish nurse from rather a dingy lodging.

Our Communal House should be a beautiful thing, full of peace and rest besides strenuous thinking and large planning, and open to all irrespective of their means.

But where's the money to come from? That is a purely secondary consideration, and I say it deliberately. Secondary because once we get our bishops, clergy, and faithful laity to see how vital is the provision of such a house under present conditions of Church and civil life, the money will come; there is plenty of it about. The total cost of providing such a house would not be very great, say, some £10,000, which, divided up among 50,000 Communicants in the diocese, comes, on an average, to about 4s. a head, or 4d. a month, or less than 1d. a week for a year. With an annual grant of £1,000 (on an average less than 5d. per annum from 50,000 Communicants) would meet all the necessary expenses of up-keep, and enable those who used the house to contribute just what they could afford, much or little or nothing, according to their means.

With such a house available all the year round, it would be possible to arrange for Clergy Schools, Clergy Retreats, Lay Schools, Retreats and Conferences to suit the convenience of all, and in a few years' time I believe that such a house would be made use of every week of the year, and in a very short time a demand would be made for others.

I have tried in this article to sketch out a practical method for tackling what I believe to be the most urgent problem with which the Church in England is faced to-day. There are, doubtless, other methods better still; these will be discovered by experience in due course when once the leaders of the Church realize the problem and its significance: that is the most important thing of all.

MICHAEL ST. ALBAN:

MISCELLANEA

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

An inquiry from a priest as to the best theological books in French was referred to (*a*) The Abbot of Pershore; (*b*) Dr. Sparrow-Simpson; (*c*) Fr. Lattey, S.J. The answers were of quite extraordinary value, and we are deeply indebted to these scholars for the trouble they took. Dr. Sparrow-Simpson's list is confined to books published since 1900.

(A) The Abbot of Pershore.

It is to be regretted that your correspondent is not more explicit. Perhaps there are, broadly, three "angles" in modern French Theology.

I. "Sane" Thomism.—Here the "Catechism of the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas for the Use of the Faithful," by R. T. Pègues, O.P., adapted from the French by A. Whitacre, O.P. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 6s.) would give the main points simply. More advanced: "A Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy," by Cardinal Mercier, translated by T. L. Parker and S. A. Parker (2 vols., 1916; London: Kegan Paul, £1). Sertillanges, "St. Thomas Aquin" (Paris: Alcan, 12 francs); Sertillanges, "L'Église," English translation (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1913, 12s.); Garrigou-Lagrange, "Dieu, son Existence et sa Nature" (Paris: Beauchesne, 10 francs). Some such books as these must be read if your correspondent is to get the general "view-point" of French theology.

II. French Theology and "Modernity" (Not Modernism).—Souben, "Nouvelle Théologie dogmatique," 9 fascicules, about 1s. 6d. each (Paris: Beauchesne), simple. For the methods on which French theology works: Sertillanges, "La Vie intellectuelle" (Librairie des Jeunes, 1, Rue de Luynes, Paris, VII^{e}); Fonk, "Le Travail scientifique" (*ibid.*, 6 francs); Bréhier et Desdevises, "Du Dezert, Le Travail historique" (*ibid.*, 1 franc); Chavigny, "L'Organisation du Travail intellectuel" (*ibid.*, 5 francs).

The *Series* called "Science et Religion," published by Bloud et Cie, Paris, simple and cheap. Some of the books mentioned above under the heading Thomism are relevant here also.

III. The Historico-Critical School of the Paris Institut Catholique (*e.g.*, Batiffol, Duchesne, Lebreton, D'Alès, etc.).—Here the *Series* "Bibliothèque de Théologie historique" (published by Beau-

chesne, 117, Rue de Rennes, Paris; complete catalogue from Burns Oates and Washbourne) will give your correspondent all he may want in this line.

For Devotional Books, which *get behind* modern Romanism, the "Collection 'Pax,'" published by the Benedictines of Maredsous and by Lethielleux, 10, Rue Cassette, Paris (complete catalogue from Burns Oates and Washbourne).

On the whole, I should strongly advise your correspondent to get: (*a*) "Dictionnaire apologétique de la Foi catholique," edited by D'Alès, published by Beauchesne, Paris (Burns and Oates), many fascicules, about 5s. each. This Dictionary covers the whole ground, in the light of modern knowledge and scholarship—dogma, liturgies, modern economic, social, etc., problems, etc. (*b*) "Catalogue méthodique des Sciences religieuses" (Revue des Jeunes, 3, Rue de Luynes, Paris, VII^{e}), giving the most representative books, about 3s., Burns and Oates).

(B) Dr. Sparrow-Simpson.

I. Beginning with Biblical criticism, among the chief works on the Modernist side are: A. Loisy, "Le Quatrième Évangile," 1903 (new edition 1922); "Les Évangiles synoptiques" (2 vols., 1907); "Jésus et la Tradition évangélique," 1910. While, of course, immense influence has been exerted by "L'Évangile et l'Église" (published earlier).

To those may be added the writings of Houtin, "La Question biblique chez les Catholiques de France au xix^{e} Siècle," 1902; "La Question biblique au xx^{e} Siècle," 1906; "Histoire du Modernisme catholique," 1913.

Le Roy (a disciple of Bergson, on whom he wrote an exposition in 1913, "Une Philosophe nouvelle") published "Dogme et Critique" in 1907. Le Roy and Laberthonnière were two of the most philosophic writers on the Modernist side.

Biblical criticism of the Catholic School in France, naturally much influenced as replies to the Modernist, includes the following: The Dominican, Lagrange, "Évangile selon Saint Marc," 1911; "Selon Saint Luc," 1921; "Selon Saint Matthieu," 1923. These works are all on a large scale. Of less dimensions are three separate commentaries by Vincent Rose, also a Dominican, "Évangile selon S. Matthieu," "Selon S. Marc," "Selon S. Luc," all published in 1904. These were followed by "Des Actes des Apôtres" in 1907. Vincent Rose had previously published in 1902 a very useful little volume called "Études sur les Évangiles," 1902, which includes excellent chapters on the Virgin Birth, the Kingdom of God, the Son of God, and the Empty Tomb. An English translation of this book has appeared.

There are also a series of works by Lepin: "La Valeur historique du Quatrième Évangile," 2 vols., 1910; "Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu," 1910; "Les Théories de M. Loisy," 1911. Also the very able book by Batiffol, to which eminent Protestant critics have felt bound to reply, "L'Enseignment de Jésus," 1905. Then there is "La Théologie de Saint Paul," 2 vols., 1908, by the Jesuit theologian Prat.

Mignot, the gifted ecclesiastic who became Archbishop of Albi, very sympathetic towards Modern Movements, strove in "L'Église et la Critique," 1910, to act as mediator between Modernist theories and Catholicism.

II. On Dogma in general, the most distinguished writers are Tixeront,

Turmel, Batiffol, and Duchesne. Duchesne: "Histoire de l'Église," 3 vols., second edit., 1906. Turmel's chief works are: "Histoire de la Théologie positive depuis l'Origine jusqu'au Concile de Trent," 1904, and its continuation, "Histoire . . . du Concile de Trente au Concile du Vatican," 1906. And last, but by no means least, his smaller book of very great interest for its conspicuous fairness, "Histoire du Dogme de la Papauté," 1908.

Tixeront's chief work is "Histoire des Dogmes," 3 vols., 1909. To which should be added his recent "Mélanges de Patrologie et d'Histoire des Dogmes," 1921. This is especially valuable for an article on Nature and Person, pp. 210-227.

Of Batiffol, there is the well-known book, also translated in English, "L'Église naissante et le Catholicisme," 1911. This is a Catholic counterpart to Loisy's "L'Évangile et l'Église."

III. On the doctrine of God there is "Études sur la Doctrine chrétienne de Dieu," 1917, by Lobstein; written from the standpoint of the Liberal Protestant. He is professor at Strasbourg. There is from the Catholic School, "Les Origines de Dogme de la Trinité," 1910, by Lebreton, professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris. Above these there is the massive and monumental work, in four large volumes, by de Régnon, "Études de Theologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité." This remarkable work is a profound philosophical study by a very learned student of the Greek Fathers.

IV. On the doctrine of the Atonement I do not know anything in French to compare with Rivière, "Le Dogme de la Rédemption," 1915. This has been translated into English and produced in two volumes. It is a careful study of the history of the doctrine.

V. On the Virgin Birth, there is the negative work of the Liberal-Protestant Lobstein, translated in Williams and Norgate's series. Advocating the traditional belief is the essay, already mentioned, by Vincent Rose; also "Marie dans l'Église Anténicéenne," Neubert, 1908.

VI. On the Resurrection of Our Lord, there is a book by Mangenot, professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, "La Résurrection de Jésus," 1910. Also another by Jacquier et Bourchany, "La Résurrection de Jésus-Christ," 1911.

VII. The doctrine concerning the Church is interestingly treated by Sertillanges, professor at the Catholic Institute at Paris. It is entitled simply "L'Église." It was published in two volumes in 1917, and has since appeared in English. On the Eucharist there is a volume in the Études d'Histoire et de la Théologie positive by Batiffol, "L'Eucharistie, la Présence réelle et la Transubstantiation."

VIII. On the bearing of Psychology on Religion may be mentioned "Psychologie des Foules," 1907, by Gustave le Bon, translated under the title of "The Mind of the Crowd"; "La Prière, Essai de Psychologie religieuse," by Segond, 1911. And, of course, Baudouin, "Suggestion et Autosuggestion," 1910, translated by E. and C. Paul, 1920.

IX. On the subject of Religion in France there is Léon Chaine, "Les Catholiques français et leurs Difficultés actuelles," 2 vols., 1904, 1908. These volumes may be described as the work of a penitent Catholic and impenitent Liberal; written to show that Catholics in France owe much of their troubles to themselves, but that the persecution to which the Church has been subjected is wholly unjustifiable. From a Protestant but sympathetic standpoint there is Paul Sabatier's "L'Orientation religieuse

de la France actuelle," 1911. Also from a Protestant and extremely critical and hostile standpoint is Guignebert, "Le Problème religieux dans la France d'Aujourd'hui," 1922. From the Catholic standpoint a most interesting series of volumes have been written by Rouzic, "Le Renouveau catholique." The main divisions are: Religion in France before the War, during the War, and since the War. The revival of faith in Catholicism is very well described.

X. On the relation of Church and State: Briand, "La Separation des Églises et de l'État," 1905; Paul Sabatier, "Séparation des Églises et de l'État," 1906.

XI. On social problems in modern life, there are three volumes of Essays by Georges Goyau, entitled, "Autour du Catholicisme social."

XII. A few biographies throwing much light on religion in France may be noted: Chauvin, "Le Père Gratry," 1910; Baudrillart, "Vie de Mgr. d'Hulst," 2 vols., 1912. This is indispensable for appreciating the state of criticism in the Church in France.

Three books on Pascal should also be read. The revived interest of Frenchmen in their great apologist is remarkable. Strowski, "Pascal et son Temps," 3 vols., 1910-13; Chevalier, "Pascal," 1922 (this is written by a disciple of Boutroux); and "Blaise Pascal," by Victor Giraud, 1923.

On Renan and Taine, and present-day thought on these two chief non-religious influences in France during the previous generation, may be read: Pierre Lasserre, "Renan et Nous," 1923, recently revised in the "Literary Supplement of *The Times*"; and Victor Giraud, "Essai sur Taine."

For French Protestantism there is "Alexandre Vinet," by G. Rambert, 1912, fourth edition. Also Auguste Sabatier, "Les Religions d'Autorité et la Religion de l'Esprit," 1904 (translated into English). And for theories of a rationalistic type, much information will be found in "Travaux du 6e Congrès international du Progress religieux (Chrétiens progressifs et Libres-croyants)," Paris, 1913.

XIII. For popular apologetics much may be learnt from Ferdinand Brunetière, "Questions actuelles—La Science et la Religion," eighth edition, 1913. Also from the same writer's "Discours de Combat." These present a layman's defence of the Catholic Faith.

Much help will be found in "The Masters of Modern French Criticism," by Irving Babbitt, Professor of French literature in Harvard, 1913; also in "France Herself Again," by Ernest Dimnet, 1914; also in "Recent French Tendencies," by the late G. C. Rawlinson, 1917 (in the series of handbooks ot Catholic Faith and Practice); also in the exhaustive and scholarly work, "Geistige Kämpfe im modernen Frankreich," by Hermann Platz, 1922, where reference will be found to a large number of books not mentioned in the present list.

(C) Father Lattey, S.J.

Father Lattey was away from his books. He pointed out that French theological literature was overwhelming in bulk, and an answer to so vague an inquiry was bound to be unsatisfactory. He agreed in recommending the "Dictionnaire apologétique" as the best single work.

THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Translated from the Codex Bezae, with an introduction on its Lucan origin and importance. By J. M. Wilson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1923. 3s. 6d.

DIE APOSTELGESCHICHTE DES LUCAS. By Th. Zahn. 1921.

INTRODUCTION AU NOUVEAU TESTAMENT. T. III. Les Actes. By M. Goguel. 1922.

DER TEXT DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS. By A. Pott. 1919.

Since the days of Westcott and Hort the so-called "Western" text has steadily grown in importance in the eyes of critics. No one has dared to challenge the critical editions by bringing out a New Testament based on another type of text than that found in the best Greek manuscripts, but it is generally recognized that a reading found in the Old Syriac and Latin Versions cannot be rejected without the most serious consideration. The problem is most interesting to the general reader in the Acts, where a series of additions are found in the most representative member of the Western group, Codex Bezae, which may be original, and add appreciably to our knowledge of Christian origins. Prof. J. H. Ropes has in preparation for Drs. Foakes-Jackson and Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity* a critical edition of the Western Text of Acts, regarded as a separate recension to be restored by the ordinary critical processes. This has been already done by Blass, but his work should be superseded by the riper scholarship of the expected book and the fuller resources at the editor's disposal. When the recension has been reconstructed, it can then be compared with the canonical text of Acts. At present scholars are inclined to pick out isolated readings which appeal to them as likely to be authentic, and to judge the whole text by these; whereas the true method is to judge the individual readings by the character of the text as a whole.

The Western text is best studied in the Acts, but if it is only studied there, we are liable to exaggerate its importance. In the Epistles its divergences from the ordinary text are comparatively small, but, such as they are, fall into line with the general characteristics of the Western text elsewhere.

Of the books quoted at the head of this review, Goguel and Pott give short but masterly summaries of the present state of the problem, in the main deciding against the originality of the Western text. Zahn is a whole-hearted Westerner, finding justifications for what seem to others obvious slips or glosses. Unfortunately he has introduced a further complication into an already complicated problem by calling the Western text α, though since Blass it has been known as β. Zahn has reached a great age, but his work has as fine an edge as ever. Canon Wilson's book is avowedly popular. After an introduction restating Blass's arguments, he translates the Acts as given in Codex Bezae literally, showing by varieties of type the additions to, and omissions from, the ordinary text. He claims that the reader who knows no Greek can form an opinion on the problem with the help of his book. Some of the finer points are inevitably lost, but, broadly speaking, the claim is justified. Canon Wilson took his degree as Senior Wrangler in 1859. The freshness and versatility which enable him, after a lifetime spent in other pursuits, first

to edit the Worcester *Liber Albus*, and then to write this book, are amazing.

The theory restated by Canon Wilson that St. Luke made a first draft of the Acts, from which the β text is descended, and then revised and shortened it, producing a version which is the parent of the canonical Acts, has no intrinsic improbability. Canon Wilson thinks an unprejudiced reader will think the case proved. But there is a great deal to be said on the other side which is not represented in his book. To present the case as fairly as possible we transcribe two passages: (*a*) xii. 1-17, in which a famous addition is made by Codex Bezae; and (*b*) xvi. 35-40, where the recensions differ widely. Phrases in italics are found in Codex Bezae and not in the ordinary text.

In (*a*) a large part of the section can be omitted.

(*a*) Codex Bezae. (Wilson's version.)	Revised Version.
1. Now about that time Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the Church *in Judaea* . . .	Now about that time Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the Church . . .
3. And when he saw that *his laying hands upon the faithful* pleased the Jews, he proceeded to seize Peter also . . .	And when he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to seize Peter also . . .
5. Peter therefore was kept in the prison: but *much* prayer in earnestness *about him* was made by the Church unto God about him . . .	Peter therefore was kept in the prison; but prayer was made earnestly of the Church unto God for him . . .
7. And behold an angel of the Lord stood by *Peter*, and a light shined in his cell; and he *nudged* Peter on the side, and awoke him, saying, Rise up quickly . . .	And behold an angel of the Lord stood by him, and a light shined in the cell: and he smote Peter on the side, and awoke him, saying, Rise up quickly. . . .
10. . . . they went out, *and went down the seven steps*, and passed on through one street . . .	. . . they went out, and passed on through one street . . .
16. . . . And they said, *Perchance* it is his angel . . .	. . . And they said, It is his angel . . .
17. But he . . . *came in and* declared unto them . . .	But he . . . declared unto them.

Notes.

1. *In Judaea.* Clearly a gloss, to make clear that the Church is not that of Antioch, mentioned just above.

3. *his laying hands upon the faithful.* A gloss, to avoid a possible ambiguity. "It" in the α text might refer either to v. 1 or the killing of James in v. 2. The β text links v. 3 with v. 1. Neither in 1 or 3 has β any claim to originality, although Zahn points out that ἐπιχείρησις in 3 is used in medical writers, and Preuschen suggests that the plural πιστούς hints at the martyrdom of James *and John*.

5. *much* and *about him* seem to be examples of carelessness in copyists. They can hardly be ascribed to St. Luke. Zahn does not attempt to defend them. Indeed, he and other supporters of the β text are inclined to pick out the plums from Codex Bezae and reject the rest of the characteristic readings as special readings of this confessedly corrupt MS.

7. *Peter.* Unimportant. *Nudged.* "Smote" might have seen unnecessarily violent. What could have led the author to alter so appropriate a word as "nudged"?

10. *the seven steps* are a sheet-anchor of the supporters of β. So vivid a touch must be original. But why did Luke omit it when he revised the first edition? The steps at first sight are those of xxi. 40, leading from the castle Antonia to the Temple. But it would be better to suppose another staircase, leading straight to the street. In *Acta Andreae et Matthiae,* c. 19, we find a sort of Midrash on this passage—Andrew visits Matthias in prison; the details follow Acts closely, and there are seven guards. Reluctant as one is to sacrifice the seven steps, they seem to spring from the same kind of brain as that which invented the seven guards.

16. *Perchance* waters down the curious conception of the angel as a double, or heavenly counterpart.

17. *came in.* The glossator reflects that otherwise Peter is left at the door.

(*b*) Codex Bezae.	Revised Version.
xvi. 35. But when it was day the magistrates *assembled together into the market place, and recollecting the earthquake that had happened they were afraid; and they* sent the serjeants, saying, Let those men go *whom yesterday thou didst receive.*	But when it was day the magistrates sent the serjeants, saying, Let those men go.
36. And the jailer *came in,* and reported the words to Paul that, The magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore come forth, and go on your journey (in peace).	And the jailer reported the words to Paul, saying, The magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore come forth, and go in peace.
37. But Paul said unto them, *Without fault alleged they* have beaten us . . .	But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us . . .
38. And the serjeants reported the magistrates *themselves* these words *which were spoken for the magistrates.* . . .	And the serjeants reported these words unto the magistrates . . .
39. And they came *with many friends into the prison* and besought them to go forth, *saying, We did not know about you that ye are just men.* And when they have brought them forth, they besought them, saying, Go forth out of this city, *lest they again assemble against us, crying against you.*	and they came and besought them; and when they had brought them out, they asked them to go away from the city.

40. And they went out of the prison, and went to Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they *reported all the things which the Lord had done for them, and* comforted them and departed.

And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed.

Detailed argument is out of place here. The additions speak for themselves. Canon Wilson, with Blass and Zahn and others, sees in them the Evangelist giving valuable information. To other minds this is the characteristic utterance of the glossator. In the main, a modern Sunday School teacher, explaining the passage, would expand it just in this way. The tendency at work is to represent the Roman authorities as favourable to the first preachers of Christianity; it was a time when relations between Church and State were strained.

These two passages provide little internal evidence in favour of the β text to outweigh the external evidence against the Bezan additions. Nevertheless, the Western text as a whole cannot be lightly dismissed. Pott, in his delightful book on the text of the New Testament, summarizes the problem thus.

The three texts, called by Westcott and Hort Syrian, Neutral, and Western, are better styled (in the same order) post-canonical, canonical, and pre-canonical. The home of the canonical text was Egypt. The text given us by modern editors is "canonical"; it represents the New Testament as read in Egypt by scholars in the third century, but does not take us back further than A.D. 200. The post-canonical text is the *Textus Receptus*. The supremacy of the canonical text was short-lived and limited to a small geographical area. The post-canonical flourished at Constantinople, and naturally from that strategic centre established its predominance; in the West the Vulgate supplanted the Greek Testament. The Western text represents the welter of different readings current in early days before any one text showed itself fittest to survive. Asia Minor is its cradle. As regards the Acts, it is noteworthy that the special readings of Codex Bezae are found mainly in the second half of the book, and in the narrative rather than the speeches.

It would seem, then, that some of the Bezan readings probably belong to an authentic tradition. But many ebbs and flows of critical opinion may be expected before scholars are agreed which they are.

W. K. L. C.

REVIEW

RELIGION SINCE THE REFORMATION. By Leighton Pullan, D.D. Fellow and Tutor of S. John Baptist's College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d. net.

Bampton Lectures, it must be admitted by one who has written them, are often dreary things. But nothing like that can be said of Dr. Pullan's. They are vivacious, enterprising, and succulent. They teem with knowledge, both ordinary and recondite. They are a marvel of compression, such as could only be achieved by an experienced lecturer, with an eye always

fixed on the essential. They are epigrammatic, witty, trenchant. And besides all this, there is through them all a genuine spirit of pastoral feeling and true religion. One never knows what will be "popular" nowadays; but these lectures certainly ought to be much read by intelligent, learned, and religious people. They may be criticized, for they criticize freely. But it will not be found at all easy to dislodge the writer from any of his conclusions. All through he has a very weighty array of evidence in support of everything he says.

Dr. Pullan writes as a historian. But he tells us, what is indeed true, that a history of the Church in the last four centuries "could not be compressed within so small a compass" as these eight lectures. He says, much too modestly, that "they are only a few studies and sketches" which he "hoped might be useful in present circumstances to members of the University" of Oxford. They will be of much wider usefulness than that. They summarize, in a way which might attract and fix the attention of every intelligent reader, the theology, the religious philosophy and practice, of the last four hundred years, and the tendencies which result from it all to-day. If they are strictly confined within the limits of their title, they certainly enable the reader to look back, and to look forward, with understanding and anticipation. And let me say at once, that if Dr. Pullan has not always found, in the history of the Church, a cordial for drooping spirits, the prospect he sees before us is hopeful. "I believe," he says, "that it is possible to combine all modern learning with a loyal adherence to the great Catholic truths for the defence of which the Bampton Lectures were founded." In its judgment on the past, and in its anticipation of the future, this is eminently a hopeful book.

To compress a book so closely compressed yet so tightly packed is difficult, perhaps impossible. Any summary I give can only be imperfect. We begin with the Counter-Reformation, taking the year 1521 as a turning-point in history, yet waiting till the third lecture till we are given an account of the typical Reformation Theology of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. From the first the theology, or the philosophy, or what hasty folk consider to be the dry history, is enlivened by sharp and piquant sketches of character—very beautiful and sympathetic often, and sometimes stinging. Only the first lecture bears any trace of hurry. It was not possible, surely, adequately to picture S. Carlo Borromeo and S. Philip Neri, S. Ignatius of Loyola and S. Francis Xavier, S. Teresa, S. Francis de Sales, Fénelon, Bossuet, and Pascal all in one lecture of thirty pages. Yet it is astonishing how vivid is Dr. Pullan's portrait of each.

And the lives converge towards a conclusion which the facts fully justify—*i.e.*, the difficulty of preserving within the Roman Communion a Catholic moderation "which Ultramontanes regard as a kind of contraband heresy"; and yet that "pure Catholicism and undefiled, like perfect holiness, is for none of us a possession, but an ideal. And the path where that can be approached most worthily will be a mean in relation to some other paths, but in itself it will be the best and the most heroic."

In the second lecture—Religion in Great Britain from 1550 to 1689—the thesis is that in the English (though not the Scottish) Reformation "in substance, though not in every detail, this system corresponds with the faith and practice common to the whole Catholic Church in East and West before the great schism of the eleventh century. And that is a common ground, a basis, which will have to be seriously considered in any comprehensive scheme for the future reunion of Christendom." If there is nothing strikingly new in this summary sketch, there is abundance of freshness in the general treatment and in the special illustrations, while music and architecture come in to emphasize principles and divergences. The sketch of Continental Protestantism from 1520 to 1700 is really masterly. It seems to me that the cardinal points of the theology of Luther and Calvin and Zwingli and Socinus have never been so justly, as well as so trenchantly, summarized. One feels that Dr. Pullan's dislikes never quench a certain sympathy which is Christian as well as human. Not even Luther or Queen Elizabeth are without their points of contact with Catholic goodness. But this chapter is really incapable of further compression. Every one who wants to understand the Reformation ought, I am tempted to say, to get it almost by heart. Yet, as I read, I note—very likely through my own stupidity—something which looks as if Dr. Pullan had for once not quite made up his mind about a fact or a tendency. "The modern capitalist is usually a child of the Ghetto or a grandchild of Geneva" (p. 83); yet "Mr. Money is a good Catholic" (p. 94).

In the fourth chapter the history of Roman Catholicism is carried on to 1854, and here the reader will find himself often on unfamiliar ground, and will frequently learn a great deal that is new as well as true, and obtain the knowledge conveyed in a sparkling and epigrammatic form. There is, of course, much matter here of acute controversy. If "Febronius" has full justice done to him, yet Joseph II. might have been more sympathetically dealt with, and (I am inclined rather temerariously to say) S. Alfonso Liguori more completely, and thus

perhaps with more full justice. Is it altogether foolish to say that Liguori's "Probabilism" is really based on the same fundamental principle as Bishop Butler's ?

In the English, Scottish, and American parts of the book—Dr. Pullan, who really seems to know everything about every out-of-the-way sect and country, denies himself the pleasure of saying much about Wales—there is a constant succession of episodical treasures, instructive, or critical, or witty, or pious. And so, again, in the extremely able chapter on "Aspects of Lutheranism and Calvinism since 1700." Here we come across one of Dr. Pullan's "pet aversions," Johann Wolfgang von Goethe; yet here again, the side of the man which appreciated Christianity and Catholicism is not forgotten. (The striking passage in the *Dichtung und Wahrheit* about his confirmation, which is so pathetic and illuminative, might have been quoted.) Other "aversions" are certainly the Jesuits and S. Alfonso. A very sympathetic chapter on the "Eastern Orthodox Church" is yet not without its critical side, too. And in the last lecture, on "Aspects of Christian Thought since 1815," Dr. Pullan is conspicuously at home. He is often triumphantly critical, but he is always the sympathetic pastor of souls, as well as the clear-eyed lover of truth. A passage of fine eloquence concludes a most impressive book.

The notes, both at the foot of the text and at the end, contain a mass of curious and out-of-the-way knowledge, artistic, linguistic, geographical, historical, which it will give many a reader pleasure to follow up. Indeed, one merit, as unusual as it is conspicuous, of these lectures is the light which they throw on many fields which may, at first sight, seem remote from their subject. Dr. Pullan can rarely refrain from telling his readers something that interests himself, whether it be the survivals of Episcopalianism in remote parts of Scotland, or the languages spoken by the Jews in different parts of the world. Sometimes, though rarely, this betrays him into an irrelevance which we really grudge him in a book so rigorously compressed; it is not of great importance to know the exact date at which a rather unimportant person died, or the condition of his liver. And if one regrets a severe reference to the past Philistinism of the writer's college, one may not resent a deserved reproof to a modern Anglican publishing society for adding to Bishop Challoner's *Garden of the Soul* in a way which seems almost deliberately to falsify the original.

W. H. Hutton.

NOTICES

Manual of English Church Music. Edited by G. Gardner and S. H. Nicholson. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Under this title one finds somewhat unexpectedly a collection of very good, up-to-date essays by experts on every subject connected with Church music. The Georgian standpoint is taken up as against the Victorian: the organ should be in a west-end gallery if possible, and the chooser of music should excise somewhat ruthlessly many of the tunes and anthems dear to the churchgoer of thirty or forty years back. Many of the best-known names of musicians and organists come in for much kindly criticism; and it is interesting in this connection to note the well-deserved strictures of Sir Richard Terry of Westminster Cathedral, in his review of Bussell's *Thirteen Arias* (*Queen*, October, 1922). Our sister church has set her house in order in this matter and we respect her for it. The weak, formless, chaotic (and often timeless) anthem or service in four parts is, we may hope, a thing of the past. Wise words are said about congregational singing (37, 189, 208, 217), which after all is the ideal aim, except in college chapels and cathedrals. Many of us can remember Dr. Roberts of Magdalen striking his organ-curtains angrily if anyone even joined in the General Confession. The new Bishop of Truro is a little too austere perhaps when he says " to take for granted that saying is normal and singing exceptional " is an inversion of the case, and in part the result of laziness.

Surely anyone who knows the average village and the average parson will be only too thankful to find the service read naturally—except in the versicles and canon, where the officiant and congregation join the immemorial tradition of Church music from earlier times. Nor can we easily accept his decision that it is a " lamentable result " that in ordinary churches the psalms on weekdays are often not sung at all ! But we cordially welcome from the same writer: " Elaborate choral vestry prayers are a still worse excrescence " than the vesper hymn. There are sound words used in the tone of reaction against many pet usages and reforms (170, 192) of the *Catholic Revival*. Canon Hephers' rebuke of Mission Hymns as " individualist to the core " will not please everybody: after all, this is the New Testament appeal throughout. Alcock's caution about the use of 16-foot stops on manual (159) should be borne in mind; one read the other day with horror of one century-old organ that had a 32-foot there ! Now and again the veil is lifted (36, 163) from the troubles of the poor officiant in the middle of a careless and inattentive east-end choir, with the organist rustling his papers behind a curtain ! " Look here, sir, I come here to sing. If I want to say my prayers, I can say them at home." It is a serious question whether the singers should not be housed, together with the organist, in the west; if the choirmaster is efficient he can keep them in order, and the minister will not be disturbed in moments that should be sacred by the petty cares of the set of a chorister's collar, the finding of the music, or the passing round of peppermints.

Very acceptable will be the account of Church music in the United States, of Nonconformist music in our own island by Sir John McClure, of Presbyterian music by Dr. W. Stewart. The editors, both of them

technical musicians and reverent Churchmen, have done their work well, and have compiled a volume of great value to clergymen, organist, and choir alike. But the average lay-member of the congregation will derive no little profit from its perusal. F. W. BUSSELL.

THOMAS DE COBHAM, BISHOP OF WORCESTER, 1317–27. Some studies drawn from his Register with an account of his life. By Ernest Harold Pearce, Litt.D., etc., Bishop of Worcester. S.P.C.K. 1923. 8vo. Pp. xi+274. 15s.

The Bishop of Worcester delights to exercise his historical faculty on the annals of every place wherein his lot is cast. Vicar of Christ Church, he edited *Annals of Christ's Hospital*. A Londoner, he dealt with *Sion College and its Library*, and wrote a valuable book on *The Sons of the Clergy*, which, like Dr. Pearce's other works, involved a vast amount of industry.

As Archdeacon of Westminster, by his *Monks of Westminster* and accounts of certain abbots, he continued the admirable literary work of the Dean of Wells and the Provost of Eton in bringing to light the history of the Abbey.

In the work before us we find that the author brings his experience as a bishop to recount the daily life and work of an early predecessor with a lively and instructive pen, recurring at times to problems of the present day.

" Keepe a good Studient from his booke, and it is wonderfull," said Justice Shallow; and it was only natural that the Bishop of Worcester should find " his booke " in an episcopal Register (left over by Mr. Bund), and should bestow it " in the little *camera* next the chapel " in Hartlebury Castle, to commune with it, and with the spirit of its begetter, in his quiet moments.

Bene Latuit! He has put readers of our Church history under great obligation by describing the diocesan life of an English bishop in the last half of Edward II.'s reign. That scholarly prelate, T. de Cobham, after being refused " confirmation " by Clement V. to the primacy, to which the chapter at Canterbury had elected him in May, 1313, was kept waiting as a canon in subdeacon's order until he was called again to Avignon to be consecrated for Worcester in May, 1317. The papacy had established, in 1302, a precedent for " provision " or " reservation " of English bishoprics, which was continued in the case of Worcester right on (with one exception) until 1535, when the last of four successive Italians, provided for that see, was removed and replaced by Latimer's appointment.

The monk of Malmesbury, who wrote a *Life of Edward II.*, styles Cobham "*flos Catinae*," and testifies, as other chroniclers did, to his skill in letters. On the next page* the monk laments that the papal policy of " providing " so many " aliens " had rendered resident deans an extinct species, and was working havoc in the roll of canons. Cobham himself (with some help) in the course of the ten years of his episcopate ordained 415 acolytes, with other orders in large numbers.† He found his diocese " swarming with clerks," but so many of them had brought mandates from Clement V., or John XXII., that he could not himself give due preferment to those whom he brought up at his own table at Hartlebury.

C. WORDSWORTH.

* *Chron. Edw. I. et II.*, vol. ii., pp. 196-7.

† In April, 1337, while Bp. Hemenhale lingered at Avignon, 849 were ordained at Worcester.

ST. PAUL ON TRIAL. By J. I. Still. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The thesis here maintained is that the book of Acts was written as part of the preparation of the defence for St. Paul's trial at Rome. The author scolds other scholars for their blindness to so important a truth. His attitude towards their labours may be judged from the following passage (p. 88): "All the attacks on it [Acts], mostly the envious attempts of infidelity to subvert its testimony, and all the apologetic excuses for it, mostly ill-assorted interpretations of well-meaning patronage to defend it, have been together utterly put to shame" [*i.e.* by recent discoveries]. The quality of his own scholarship appears in the assertion that *we know* St. Luke to have written his Gospel before 2 Cor. viii. 16-18, which refers ("there is no reason to think otherwise") to St. Luke's praise *on account of* his Gospel ("*In*, in a multitude of N.T. cases, means 'on account of'"). Also in the statement that St. Mark had written his Gospel before St. Paul's first missionary journey when he went as a *minister*, the word being a technical term for one in charge of the Scriptures, see Luke iv. 20. Dr. Still's case might have been stated in a plausible manner, but unfortunately he seems to have no conception of what is or is not valid evidence, with the result that scholars are unlikely to take him seriously. What, for example, is the value of a train of argument like this? "Roman law forbade proselytizing. . . . The Jewish religion, however, was bound in duty to win proselytes to the faith of Jehovah, and Roman law must have regarded proselytizing as privileged 'according to their Scriptures.' Yet there must have been a limit dictated, even to the Jews, by Roman law. Proselytes to Judaism came from a class of Gentiles familiar with synagogue worship and voluntarily entering the Jewish Church. If, however, a propaganda were directed towards the purely pagan, it must have assumed the character of illegal proselytizing" (p. 50). Note the three-fold "must have" in place of evidence.

The story of Pentecost is subjected to some curious exegesis. The mighty wind is the sighing of the Christians, the tongues of fire their fervent speech, "his own tongue" heard by the crowd is Greek instead of the Hebrew expected in the Temple services. These are not put forward as the probable occurrences which lie behind the narrative but as the actual meanings intended by St. Luke. We have given more space to the book than can really be spared lest the deservedly high repute of the Student Christian Movement books should be thought by our readers to recommend one which falls below the expected level.

W. K. L. CLARKE.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By J. Herbert Williams, M.A. Murray, 1923.

This book is written by a Roman Catholic layman, and has the *imprimatur* of his Church. Its design is to collect together those passages from the New Testament which show the opinion its writers had of Him of Whom they wrote.

The style is somewhat peculiar. As an example may be given the passage (p. 5) in which the author states his purpose:

"But the complete collection of passages in Gospel and Epistle so apparently importing, their analytical determination of meaning against misunderstanding that belongs to a routine and unreflecting perusal, the

contrary elucidation of texts that are made prominent in Unitarian disputation, the multitude and congruity of references brought into view, may perhaps give occasion for reflection, may raise a disturbing doubt that had not been felt before."

Another example can be found on p. 16:

"The theological *distinguo* which has been expressed, and which undeniably represents the Catholic doctrine, suffices to explain any imperfection in the belief of the chosen disciples during the pre-Resurrection period as also suffices for the manner of the Evangelical narrative."

Similarly, we have strange phrases, "the etiology of the original Greek," "the Epistolary writers," "inexpugnable for the intelligent critic"; as well as strange words, such as indoctrination, obfuscation, metonym (=synonym). These could be multiplied greatly, and would "frighten away" an ordinary reader much more than the mere "occurrence of Greek sentences" (p. viii) in the text.

Choice of style must, however, be left to the individual author. If anyone chooses to write so that his words read in places like a translation from a foreign tongue he is at perfect liberty to do so. We may feel that he is thereby missing his objective, but that is his look-out.

On the other hand, there is ground for legitimate objection when we read (p. 81) about the clause of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" in 1 John v. 7, that it is not found in any *uncial* manuscript. This might seem to imply that the cursive manuscripts have the clause, the truth of course, being that the Greek evidence for the clause reduces itself to that of one single cursive (probably forged) MS. of the sixteenth century.

Again, on the next page we have (in a note) the words:

"The reading of the Vulgate Version always claims consideration in determining the true Greek text, as it is prior in date to any extant codex. The Vulgate, of course, has the seventh verse in its entirety."

This, to one unacquainted with the facts, is quite misleading. Even if we date every extant Greek codex after the time of St. Jerome, the facts remain that the extant MSS. of the Vulgate were written much later, and that the best of them do not contain the clause. The proofs of the Clementine Vulgate were not corrected by St. Jerome.

There is another passage (p. 23*n*) relative to the Vulgate, in which we confess not to understand the author's meaning. In this, referring to Fr. Maas's edition of St. Matthew's Gospel, he writes:

"The learned editor gives Matt. i. 23, according to the Vulgate version, 'Behold a virgin shall be with Child,' without mention of the exact rendering of the Greek of the Evangelist (as well as of the passage of Isaiah quoted by him) which the English language admits, 'Behold,' *the* virgin shall conceive.'"

Surely the Latin word can be translated "the virgin" as well as "a virgin," and the reference to the Hebrew is perhaps unfortunate, as many doubt whether the word used there means "virgin" necessarily.

It must be a slip of the pen surely that on p. 43 we read that the denial of the "reality of His human nature" was a mark of the *Nestorian* heresy.

There are several other minor points to which one might raise objection, but the great objection is that the book is too dogmatic. The author's view is the right one, and that is all there is about it. His purpose is good, but we doubt much that his work can have the effect intended.

J. M. HARDEN.

THE STORY OF THE RESURRECTION. By the Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Murray, 1923. 7s. 6d.

This volume consists of a series of addresses given in various years at Canterbury. Their author requires no introduction. He has written much during his long life, and, though he speaks of the present book as the last that he is likely to write, we are sure that many will share our hope that this will not be so.

The Addresses go through the narrative in the Gospels and the Acts from Dawn on the First Easter morning to the Final Scene on Olivet forty days later. They are primarily devotional, but they are much more than that. Though "not written with either a dogmatic or an apologetic purpose," the author hopes "that this simple appreciation of the story will . . . be the best defence of its trustworthiness." We feel that this is so, though there are some (perhaps many) minor points which we might explain differently. J. M. HARDEN.

MACROBIUS OR PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE AND LETTERS IN THE YEAR 400. By Thomas Whittaker. Cambridge University Press. 1923. Crown 8vo. Pp. viii+102. 6s. 6d. net.

A work like this is of no small interest to students of Christian history, even if only a reminder of the singular and studied silence towards Christianity on the part of notable pagan writers at the very time when Christian intellectual activity was so marked. Before the death of Macrobius, Ambrose and Jerome and Augustine were widely known and influential figures, and Christianity had a growing voice in matters political, yet of all this stir and movement Macrobius says never a word, has never a hint. Apart from the protest of Symmachus, paganism died in a proud and uncondescending reticence. A literary tradition entirely aloof from, and uninfluenced by, the religious life of the age is no new thing, especially to-day, but its presence at this splendid noon-day of Christian productivity is a needed reminder that Christianity can be in full ferment within itself, and within its own domain, yet powerless and unrecognized without.

Macrobius is of undoubted interest for his own sake: he was a quickening influence on the Middle Ages, handing on in the old and traditional forms a knowledge of Platonism quite apart from its adaptation to Christianity. For English readers Macrobius will always be gratefully remembered as the starting-point of Chaucer's dream in *The Parlement of Foules*.

Mr. Whittaker has given a careful and valuable account of the *Saturnalia* and *Scipio's Dream*, proving his assertion that though Macrobius was a compiler, he had a mind capable of making out of his sources a coherent system, marked by sound sense and critical acumen. Mr. Whittaker seems to share Macrobius' reticence towards Christianity, though here and there are glimpses of a lack of sympathy, to say no more, towards it. P. 11—Mr. Whittaker's agreement with F. W. Hall that the preservation of culture in Western Europe is due to the efforts of the pagan nobles of the Theodosian epoch—is worth a fuller examination; certainly the attitude of the Christian writers of the time was on the whole hostile to secular learning, but they were themselves steeped in it and handed on *that* tradition in spite of their words. P. 13: Boethius "perhaps compiled some text-books of Christian theology," whose

"genuineness is still doubtful"; the discovery of Cassiodorus' actual attribution of these theological tractates to his friend Boethius, and the final quietus given to the denial of Boethian editorship by Usener as far back as 1877, have then been all in vain! P. 68, note 3, the quotation from Lucan is incorrect. J. H. BAXTER.

BOOK NOTES

The *Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament.* By Arthur Phillips. Bale and Danielsson. 10s. 6d.

If books of this character are to have any influence with thoughtful readers, they must make an honest attempt to understand the views attacked. The author in this case cannot be said to have done so. Time after time he misrepresents his opponents. Thus p. 31 (about the early narratives of Genesis): "The picture here presented of Israel grubbing among the dust-heaps of Babylon and picking up this treasure too foul for use until purged of everything it contained except the most obvious facts. . . ." Who does present such a picture? Page 119: "The mark of P is the name Elohim." By substituting *the* for *a* the opponent's position is made ridiculous. "Conservative criticism" comes off as badly as criticism. "There is no admitted common ground in the case of the Bible and *any* other book" (p. 72) is typical of the author's attitude.

St. Peter: His Name and His Office. By T. W. Allies. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

Here we have apparently a reissue of a book published in 1852 and reprinted in 1871. The usual practice of indicating its previous history by a bibliographical note has not been followed. Nearly 300 pages are devoted to the New Testament evidence for the prerogatives of St. Peter. The usual passages are well expounded. But the effect of the argument is lessened by the piling up of evidence, good, bad, and indifferent. Thus in Acts viii. 14 St. Peter is said to send himself (and St. John). In ix. 32 St. Peter goes "through all" but in xv. 36 St. Paul only visits the churches he founded. In xii. 5 we read that continuous prayer was made for St. Peter: nothing similar happened when St. Paul was arrested. In 1 Cor. i. 12 we are to note the ascending scale: "I of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ." Peter is next to Christ! These are but a few of the many bad arguments.

The Whole Tithe. By P. W. Thompson. Marshall Bros. 6s.

A chartered accountant describes the Biblical tithe-system, beginning with Cain. Tithes and offerings made a tax of 3s. 4d. in the £. An interesting tabular statement is given, showing the precise sums which a Hebrew farmer paid, reckoned in English money, over a term of years. Former scholars who have written on the subject have gone grievously astray. The second part of the book deals with practical matters. Let us give the whole tithe, a full tenth, though a sixth is recommended, being equivalent to the Hebrew tithes and offerings. The reader gets the impression that if this is done the problem will be how to deal with the influx of wealth, for the tithe-payer "repaid a thousandfold will be." But gifts out of capital are wrong unless for endowment purposes, and to give more than the Scriptural amount out of income is reprehensible.

Spirit and Personality: An Essay in Theological Interpretation. By W. S. Bishop. Longmans. 5s.

With great regret we relegate this book to a column of Notes. If discussed at all, it needs a long review for which we have no space. Dr. Bishop, formerly Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of the South, has Dr. Du Bose's acute insight coupled with a lucidity often lacking in the latter's writings. The present volume is one of great interest, which we strongly urge our readers to buy and read. Dr. Du Bose's own recommendation is as follows: "I have read and re-read your discussion of the Theology of the Holy Spirit, and accept it as a definite and positive contribution to Catholic truth. Not only is it true, but the truth is more effectively stated and historically related than I have ever elsewhere seen it. . . ."

Christianity and the Religions of the World. By Albert Schweitzer. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

Two lectures on comparative religion, delivered at Selly Oak, make up this modest little volume, which would hardly deserve attention but for the personality of the author. When one has read *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* and *On the Edge of the Primaeval Forest* and realized what manner of man the greatest living authority on Bach must be, the conclusion is irresistible that Dr. Schweitzer is one of the greatest Christians of our time. On p. 85 he makes a striking remark: "Preaching the Gospel in foreign lands to-day, we are the advance-guard of an army that has suffered defeat and needs to be made fit again."

Of Mass. By Joseph Boland. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s.

This is "a pioneering attempt to aid Christians in making their assistance at Mass an act of 'rational worship' of God." It is largely concerned with the Hebrew sacrificial system and, though it contains much useful matter, is written in an unattractive style.

Ministerial Commission. By C. S. Carter. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Carter, a priest of the Church of England, practically adopts the Protestant view of the ministry, as held by Dr. Lindsay and others. If the New Testament passages are to be studied by themselves without reference to later Church history, and if it is legitimate to look on the latter, not as guided by the Holy Ghost, but as a course of steady decline from original purity, then his position is one of considerable strength. But it is not that of the English Church as seen in the Ordinal. Mr. Carter argues that the Commission of John xx. 23 was given to the Church as a whole and not to the apostles; but the Prayer Book interprets the passage otherwise, by reserving it for the Ordination of Priests. He uses many arguments to minimize the significance of episcopacy, including an argument from silence—the absence of a sermon at the Consecration of Bishops showing "how necessary such order is in the Church of Christ" (p. 64). Statements that "Matthias is chosen by the voice of the whole company of believers" (p. 6; *cf.* Acts i. 24: "Lord . . . show whether of these two Thou hast chosen") and that Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was "about six years later" than Ignatius (p. 30) do not inspire the reader with confidence.

The Faith in Fiction. By A. D. Kelly. Faith Press. 3s. 6d.

Fr. Alfred Kelly is never dull, and the reader will pass an instructive evening under his guidance. A good book on the religious currents of recent years as revealed by the English novel would be a great boon, but would demand an equipment possessed by few writers. Anyone who attempts it enters a field made illustrious by the masters of literary criticism, and must expect to be judged by an exacting standard. Fr. Kelly has read many novels and culled from them passages interesting to a priest, to which he has added shrewd observations. His book reads like a collection of magazine articles which have not been worked into a unity.

A Large Room: A Plea for a More Inclusive Christianity. By S. C. Carpenter. Longmans. 6s.

The thesis is that every Christian should be at once Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal, and that considerable liberty of experiment should be allowed. The book shows the mind of a vigorous and experienced worker and thinker and contains many good things. It suffers from the vagueness of all books which deal with things in general, and the reader is left with no very clear impressions when he has reached the end. But he will not regret the hours spent with Mr. Carpenter.

Anglo-Catholicism and Reunion. By S. H. Scott. R. Scott. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Scott's thesis is that grave difficulties are being put in the way of reunion with the East (and *a portion* with the West) by the Christological utterances of certain Anglo-Catholics, such as Bishop Gore, or, in a lesser degree, the Bishop of Zanzibar, which are irreconcileable with St. Cyril and St. John Damascene.

W. K. L. C.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

Several of our Missionary Priests are asking for THEOLOGY. If some of its readers would post on their copies, I should be delighted to give them a name and address.

You once kindly put in a notice for me, which had excellent results. It would be most kind if you would do so again,

Yours faithfully,

(MISS) M. L. KIRKPATRICK,
Newspaper Secretary,
15, Tufton Street, S.W. 1.

December 10, 1923.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER